COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1809. [Price 10d.

ANNE, BARONESS GRENVILLE, wife of Lord Grenville, has, for life, a Pension of 1,500 pounds a year, to commence from the Death of Lord Grenville.

LADY LOUISA PAGET, a daughter of the Earl of Uxbridge, has now a Pension of 300 pounds a year, which pension she has had, since the year 1801.

THE MARCHIONESS OF STAFFORD had, until January 1807, a Pension of 300 pounds a year. Whether it has since been resigned does not appear.

CHARLES ABBOT, Esq. Speaker of the House of Commons, besides his salary and house, as Speaker, the salary being 6,000 pounds a year, holds the sinecure place of Keeper of the Signet in Ireland, the annual value of which place is 1,500 pounds a year, and which place he has for life.

In the Account of Places and Pensions, laid before Parliament in June last, it is stated, that, in the year ending on the 8th of April, 1808, the sum of 4,271 pounds was paid to *Servants* of the late *Queen Caroline*, and the late *Princess of Wales*; that is to say, to Servants of the present King's Grandmother and Mother. In this sum is included 18*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.* annually paid, even last year, to an *alms-house* in *Hanover*.

The same Account exhibits a charge of 200 pounds a year, paid to Ministers at *Amsterdam* and *Rotterdam*, and this is stated as actually paid up to 5th January, 1807, without any notification that the payment is to be discontinued.

"Let those think now, who never thought before,
"And those who always thought, now think the more."

POPE.

DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 252.)

IN my last, I stated very fully the reasons why the people should, as to public matters, fix their attention solely upon what was going on in the House of Commons; and, I endeavoured to point out to them the way, in which they ought to *apply* the facts that came to light; the way, in which they ought to trace the corruptions to the injury of themselves and families.——It now becomes necessary to give an Analysis of the Examinations which have been published; for, though they have all been read, with great avidity, in the daily papers, which papers have discovered, upon this occasion, wonderful capacity, and a very laudable zeal for affording that "*publicity*," which appeared to be so anxiously desired by the friends of the Duke of York; though the examinations have all been read, in that shape, day after day, the interesting facts contained in them must, in the mind of every reader, as they do in mine, lie in a confused state; because, it has necessarily happened, that the cases have not been kept distinct; evidence relating to one case has been brought out during the examination into another case; the cases have, in fact, run into one another, like the branches of plants too luxuriant for their space. To separate them, therefore, to draw to the stem of each its own branches, so that every individual case may stand clearly exposed to the view and inspection of the public, seems to me to be likely greatly to further the cause of truth; and, indeed, to be absolutely necessary to the forming of a right conclusion.——Considering the mass of Evidence that lies before me, I am not unaware of the arduousness of this task, to be performed by one person, in a space of time necessarily so short; but, there are few things of this sort that any man of common capacity cannot accomplish, if he set resolutely about it; and, at any rate, seeing how large a portion of the public attention I have, for so long a time, enjoyed, it is a duty which I owe that public to make the attempt.——It is necessary further to premise, that this analysis will extend no further than the examinations of Friday, the 17th instant, inclusive, that being the period to which I am in possession of the Evidence. It is possible, that, at a later date, fresh examinations may take place, touching cases, whereon it now appears the evidence is closed. If that should happen, and if any new facts, at all material, should transpire, I shall hereafter notice them, making at the same time, reference to the case, or cases, upon which they bear.——No desire was ever more clearly, or more strongly expressed, than the desire on the part of the Duke of York, that *publicity* should be given to all these proceedings; and, so entirely do I agree in that wish, that, before I have done with the subject, my intention is, not only to communicate every fact of importance

to the public, but also, to furnish a *Table of Contents*, and a complete *Index*, to the whole; so that, with the least possible difficulty, the reader may, at any moment, refer to any part, whether of the Evidence, the Debates, or the Comments. This is not a matter that ought to pass away like a summer's cloud; it is not, and it ought not to be, the subject of a nine day's wonder: it is an event, which, sooner or later, must lead to great consequences; it will, in short, form an epoch in the History of this nation; therefore, it ought to be put upon record with fidelity and clearness, in every publication wherein the mention of it shall find a place, and especially in a work professing to be a Political Register. ——As to the manner of the Analysis, upon which I am about to enter, I shall endeavour to follow, as nearly as I am able, the example of an impartial judge, when he is what is commonly called *summing up the evidence upon a trial*; and, if I do strictly adhere to this most excellent example, neither party can possibly have reason to complain.——I shall not confine myself to such cases as are merely of a *military* nature; for, though Mr. Wardle's *Charges* were so confined, other matters have came out, and, in all, the people are interested full as deeply as if they were matters solely connected with the office of the Commander in Chief. The first head, therefore, under which I shall enter upon this Analysis, is that of

THE ADULTROUS INTERCOURSE.

The existence of this Intercourse has not been attempted to be denied. Indeed, the whole proceeding is founded on the admission of it. But, though those who have taken the part of the Duke of York; though both sides of the House of Commons seem to give up his moral character, as far, at least, as relates to his conjugal obligations, it will be right for us to draw to a point those parts of the *Evidence*, which establish the fact of this Adultrous Intercourse.——First, then, *Mrs. Clarke* states, that she lived in the house in Gloucester Place, *under the protection* of the Duke of York; that he took the house in order to keep her there; that he made her a pecuniary annual allowance; that he bought her furniture and jewels; that he eat, drank, and lived with her.——The Duke's own servant, *Ludovick*, states, that he was the person who attended his master at Mrs. Clarke's; that his master was frequently there, and that it was part of his employment to carry his master's clothes in the morning.——Three servants of Mrs. Clarke state, that they saw the Duke there constantly; that they saw him at table with their mistress; and, at last comes *Mrs. Favourite*, Mrs. Clarke's housekeeper, who, in speaking of one particular transaction, states that she saw the Duke and Mrs Clarke *in bed* together.——*Mr. Adam* states, that Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke; that a separation took place upon his advice; and that upon this separation, he (Mr. Adam) was, upon that occasion authorized by the Duke, to tell her that he thought it his duty to give her an annuity of £.400 a year, provided her conduct should be correct.—— Lastly, we have the written evidence of *the Duke himself*, who in the following two Letters, addressed to Mrs. Clarke, and which Letters have been proved to be in his handwriting, enables us to form an unerring judgment as to the nature of the connection which existed between him and Mrs. Clarke.——

"August 4, 1805.—How can I sufficiently express to My Sweetest, My Darling Love, the delight which her dear, her pretty letter gave me, or how much I feel all the kind things she says to me in it? Millions and millions of thanks for it, My Angel! and Be assured that my heart is fully sensible of your affection, and that upon it alone its whole happiness depends.—I am, however, quite hurt that My Love did not go to the Lewes Races; how kind of her to think of me upon the occasion; but I trust that she knows me too well not to be convinced that I cannot bear the idea of adding to those sacrifices which I am but too sensible that she has made to me.—News, My Angel cannot expect from me from hence; though the life led here, at least in the family I am in, is very hurrying, there is a sameness in it which affords little subject for a letter; except Lord Chesterfield's family, there is not a single person except ourselves that I know. Last night we were at the Play, which went off better than the first night.—Dr. O'Meara called upon me yesterday morning, and delivered me your letter; he wishes much to preach before Royalty, and if I can put him in the way of it I will.—What a time it appears to me already, My Darling, since we parted; how impatiently I look forward to next Wednesday se'nnight!—God bless you, my own Dear, Dear Love! I shall miss

" the Post if I add more ; Oh believe me " ever, to my last hour, Your's and Your's " alone."

Addressed : " Mrs. Clarke, to be left " at the Post-office, Worthing."

" Sandgate, Aug. 24, 1804.—How can " I sufficiently express to My Darling " Love my thanks for her dear, dear let- " ter, or the delight which the assurances " of her love give me ? Oh, My Angel ! " do me justice and be convinced that " there never was a Woman adored as " you are. Every day, every hour con- " vinces me more and more, that my " whole happiness depends upon you alone. " What a time it appears to be since we " parted, and with what impatience do I " look forward to the day after to-morrow ; " there are still however two whole Nights " before I shall clasp My Darling in my " arms !—How happy am I to learn that " you are better ; I still however will not " give up my hopes of the cause of your " feeling uncomfortable. Clavering is " mistaken, My Angel, in thinking that " any new regiments are to be raised ; it " is not intended, only second Battalions " to the existing Corps ; you had better, " therefore, tell him so, and that you were " sure that there would be no use in apply- " ing for him.—Ten thousand thanks, My " Love, for the handkerchiefs, which are " delightful ; and I need not, I trust, as- " sure you of the pleasure I feel in wear- " ing them, and thinking of the dear hands " who made them for me.—Nothing could " be more satisfactory than the tour I " have made, and the state in which I " have found every thing. The whole of " the day before yesterday was employed " in visiting the Works at Dover ; review- " ing the Troops there, and examining " the Coast as far as this place. From " Folkstone I had a very good view of those " of the French Camp.—Yesterday I first " reviewed the Camp here, and afterwards " the 14th Light Dragoons, who are cer- " tainly in very fine order ; and from " thence proceeded to Brabourne Lees, to " see four regiments of Militia ; which, " altogether, took me up near 13 hours. " I am now setting off immediately to " ride along the coast to Hastings, review- " ing the different Corps as I pass, which " will take me at least as long. Adieu, " therefore, My Sweetest, Dearest Love, " till the day after to-morrow, and be as- " sured that to my last hour I shall ever " remain Yours and Yours alone."

Addressed, " George Farquhar, Esq. No. " 18, Gloucester-place, Portman-square."

——All that it is necessary to add to this evidence is, a statement of the well known facts, that the *Duchess of York* is living, that she is in England, and that there never has been any legal separation between her and her husband.

THE ANNUITY.

Contracts, with whomsoever made, are binding upon the parties. To break a promise is a breach of moral duty ; and, therefore, it becomes us to ascertain, as nearly as we can, the truth, with respect to the Annuity, which Mrs. Clarke was to receive, as the cast-off concubine of the Duke of York.——She herself has stated, that Mr. Adam, in the name of the Duke, promised her an Annuity of £.400 a year. In one instance she says, that Mr. Adam *guaranteed* the payment of this annuity. She complains, that for more than a year and a half it has not been paid ; and, upon this non-payment we see that she grounds all her disclosures against the Duke of York. She states, besides, that she was left, upwards of two thousand pounds in debt to divers trades-people ; and that, having since sent a remonstrance to the Duke upon the subject, the Duke insisted that she should *plead her marriage to avoid her debts*, or that she might, if she liked, go to prison. She further states, that having sent the Duke a letter, not long since, by one Taylor, a shoe-maker in Bond Street, requesting a few hundred pounds, he sent for answer, by the mouth of this same Taylor, that if she dared speak against him, or write against him, he would put her in the *pillory* or the *Bastile*. The reader will bear in mind, that this fact rests *solely* upon Mrs. Clarke's evidence ; but he will also bear in mind, that, if false, it *might have been easily disproved* by Taylor, the bearer of the message, and that Taylor *was not called to disprove it ;* and he will further bear in mind, that this threat, if he should conclude that it actually was made, was made against that very person, to whom the Duke had written the *two letters* above inserted.—— But now, as to whether the annuity was actually promised, or, if upon *conditions*, whether the breach of those conditions justified the non-performance of the promise.——Mr. Adam's words, as to the promise, are these : " I told her, that the " Duke of York thought it his *duty*, if her " conduct was *correct*, to give her an annui- " ty of £.400 a year, to be paid quarterly ; " that he would enter into no obligation in " writing, by bond or otherwise ; that it

"must rest entirely upon his word, to be "performed, or not, according to her be- "haviour." —— Her statement is, that £.500 arrears of the annuity were due *in June last.*—There seems to be no doubt of the promise having been *made*, and that, after a little while at first, it *has not been fulfilled*. It, therefore, remains for us to inquire, what were the *conditions*, if any, and whether these conditions have been observed by Mrs. Clarke.——The only condition stated by Mr. Adam to have been made by him, in the name of the Duke, was, that "her conduct should be "*correct*." This, if it can be called a condition, was, especially as coming from the lips of a lawyer, very *vaguely* expressed. The word *correct* as applied to the conduct of a person, can hardly be said to have a meaning, and, when applied to the *general* conduct of a person, has absolutely no meaning at all. In short, as used in this case, it is one of those convenient terms, that admit of *any* construction; that may be made to mean whatever the person using it chooses it should mean; that may be twisted and turned to any purpose for which it may be wanted —— The reader, therefore, leaving Mr. Adam's connection with the Duke out of the question, and leaving out of the question also Mr. Adam's general character, will ask himself, whether the internal evidence of the case would lead him to think that a person like Mrs. Clarke, would, even for a moment, have been satisfied with any promise, to which *such a condition* was attached?——But, next, *in what way* has Mrs. Clarke broken the contract? This has no where been shewn. Indeed, no attempt has been made to prove that she has violated the contract. We have no occasion to ask what was meant by the word *correct*, because no *proof* has been produced, that there was any justifiable cause for the non-fulfilment of the promise. Mr. Adam says, in explanation of the meaning of this term, that, what he meant by it was, that she should not any longer *contract debts by making use of the Duke's name;* and, no evidence has been produced, that she has done so.——That Mrs. Clarke understood, that she was to be paid £.400 a year quarterly, is evident enough; her complaints, made in letters to Mr. Adam himself, are strong presumptive proof of this; and, it is here to be observed, that Mr. Adam made no answer to these letters; that he did not repel the accusation against the Duke of having broken the promise; and that, in stating that he shewed these letters to the Duke, he does not say, that any observation was made by the Duke as to the truth or falshood of the contents of the letters. He merely says, that the Duke expressed no apprehension at the *threats;* but, does not say, that he expressed any indignation at the falshood of the charge of having broken his promise; which, however, if the charge had been false, it was very natural for him to do, and particularly to Mr. Adam, who had been his agent in this negociation with his concubine, and through whose lips the promise of the annuity had been made.——Upon the whole of this case, then, it is clear, that the promise *was made*, and that it has *not been fulfilled;* and, the question for the reader to settle in his mind is this: whether the non-fulfilment arose from a conscientious conviction, in the mind of the Duke of York, that Mrs. Clarke had violated her part of the compact; or, from a persuasion, in his mind, that his well-known power, joined to his positive threats of the *pillory* or the *Bastile*, would enable him, with impunity, to withhold the means of living from a female, on whose breast he had, for years, rioted in bliss, and to whom, but a few months before, he had vowed everlasting affection.——If the former, the decision must be, that, in this respect, the Duke is not intentionally to blame; if the latter, that he is the most unfeeling as well as the most mean of mankind.

ESTABLISHMENT IN GLOUCESTER PLACE.

The *expences* of this establishment form a very prominent and a very important branch of the inquiries, upon the sum of which, we are now endeavouring to arrive at a correct opinion; because, from a view of these expences as compared with the pecuniary allowance, immediately out of the pocket of the Duke, an inference must be drawn as to the Duke's knowing whether, or not, money must have been raised by Mrs. Clarke from sources other than his private purse.——The establishment, from the evidence of several servants, who formed part of it, appears to have consisted of a house-keeper and from three to four other females; of a butler, and, at the lowest, six other men servants; of eight horses and of two carriages. It appears, from the same concurrent testimony, that a continual round of company was kept in Gloucester Place; that a great deal of wine was drunk; and that there were frequently employed two, and

sometimes three, men-cooks. It appears, that concerts were frequent, or, at least, musical parties; that music-masters, singing boys, drawing masters, were frequently there, and that, in short, every thing was carried on in a style the most expensive that can be imagined. ——Mrs. Clarke herself states, that the servants bare *wages* and their *liveries* cost her, at least, £.1,000 a-year. She says, that the Duke paid for some of her horses, but that, in one year, she laid out £.900 in horses only.——The allowance, made to her by the Duke, for the support of this establishment, she states at £.1,000 a year, which sum, she says, she soon convinced the Duke, was hardly sufficient to defray the expences of servants wages, and of their liveries. Upon further examination, she says, that the £.1,000 a year was always very irregularly paid; that, sometimes, when she has been hard pressed by the trades-people, she has got a hundred or two pounds from the Duke; but after much examination and cross-examination, she has, to the last, persisted in averring, that the whole which she got from the Duke, did not exceed in amount from £.1,200 to £.1,500 a-year. She says, that she got divers presents, in trinkets and jewels, from the Duke; but that these were frequently *in pawn*, to the knowledge of the Duke, whose draft the pawnbroker refused to take as a surety on a proposition for their emancipation. She allows that the Duke furnished the house in Gloucester Place, generally, at the outset; but that she herself paid for the glasses, which cost her £.500. She was allowed a house at Weybridge by the Duke; and she says, that, out of her own purse, she paid from 3 to £.400 for the repair and enlargement of the house and its buildings. She allows that the Duke paid her £.500 at the outset, exclusive of the £.1000 a year. She allows, that the Duke sent a large quantity of Port wine to Gloucester Place; but says, that she bought and paid for the Madeira and Claret, a great deal of which was drunk in the house. She states, and the fact appears not to have been questioned, that, when the Duke left her, she was, at least, £.2,000 in debt, debts contracted by her, while she was in his keeping, and that this sum was exclusive of the amount of the lease of the house (£.4,400) which the Duke gave her, and which she transferred to her lawyer in part payment of debts due to him. She says, that she has heard that the Duke should say, that she might sell her trinkets to pay the remainder of her debts, but she states that he knows very well what became of them.——Being questioned as to the circumstances of her pecuniary embarrassments, while in Gloucester Place, she says, that when the tradespeople could not get money from her, they pressed for *places*; and that, though they renewed their pressing for money, when they could not get places, they were always well pleased to trust her, because, in the end, they were sure to make her pay handsomely for it — Being questioned as to the time when she began to be pressed for money, her answer is: "About half a year after my "connection with his Royal Highness be-"gan. I never applied to him; till I "found myself distressed; and, then he "told me, that I had *more interest than the* "*Queen*, and that I should use it." Being asked: "Was the Duke acquainted with "any of your transactions, respecting the "disposal of commissions, &c." Her answer is: "*With the whole of them.*"——The reader, after having made an estimate of the expences of an establishment, or rather, double establishment (including town and country) like that above described; after duly weighing in his mind the effect of charges made upon calculations of such manifest risk as well from final probable loss as from almost certain long delay; after having well considered all the consequences of the observations of servants, respecting the manner in which their mistress got her money, as well as the consequences of a total want of check or controul, whether as to quantity, quality, price, or disposal: after thus estimating and thus considering, the reader will be the better prepared for hearing the matter which Mr. Perceval brought forward, upon this part of the subject, on Friday, the 17th instant, and which, according to the fullest report that I can find of his speech, was stated in the following words.——"The "CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER before "proceeding to the letters brought up by "the select committee, said, he had a few "observations to offer in answer to a ques-"tion which had been put to him a few "nights since by an hon. gentleman under "the gallery (Mr. Cripps), with respect "to the *amount of the expence furnished by* "*the Duke of York*, for the establishment "in Gloucester-place.—As far as he could "obtain information, *no accurate account of* "*that expenditure could be got*; but so far as "he had been able to procure any items, "he would now inform the House.—By "the draughts in the house of the Duke of "York's banker, it appeared that £.5,551

"had been paid to the person who was "always employed by his royal highness, "to receive the money intended for Mrs. "Clarke. Beyond that *(as his Royal High-* "*ness authorised him to state to the Commit-* "*tee)* his royal highness frequently gave "her personally other and considerable "sums, of which, however, he had kept "no memorandum. Mrs. Clarke had "stated at the bar, that her allowance of "£. 1000 per annum, was paid in drafts. "With regard to those drafts from the "banker, if the house thought it necessary "to have any proof, they might examine "the servant, to whom they were uni-"formly paid at the banker's. This ser-"vant then took the money *to the Duke,* "who put it under a cover, sealed it, and "sent it by the same person to Mrs. "Clarke. Besides this, there were trades-"men for furniture, wine, jewels, and the "plate (with which the house was already "acquainted) to make the total amount "of £. 16,760 from Jan. 1804 to May "1806. Here the right hon. gentleman, "if it was necessary, might be called to "prove the facts he now stated, *on the au-* "*thority of his royal highness,* at the bar of "the house."——Reader; impartial read-er, does not this strike you as a very *novel* procedure? However Mr. Perceval, who came into office to protect "our holy religion," may console himself with a statement of the Duke of York having ex-pended £. 16,760 upon a concubine, while, in addition to all his immense salaries and pensions, he was borrowing £. 54,000 from the minister out of the taxes raised upon us; however *consoling* this may be to Mr. Perceval, does it not strike you, that the producing *as evidence,* facts stated *upon the authority of the party accused,* is something new, quite new, in English jurisprudence? Have you ever seen, or heard, of any thing like this before, either in parlia-ment, or in any court of justice? Is this the way in which any of us are treated, when we are tried? If there happen to be more than one judge upon the bench, do we ever see any of them pulling papers out of his pocket, and, in contradiction to evidence given before the court, state so and so, *upon the authority of the person under trial?*——But, reader, why was this state-ment kept in petto, till the last moment? Why was not the *bare word* (for it is no more) of the Duke taken before, and op-posed to the declarations of *every witness,* in every stage of the proceeding?——In short, why all this time taken up in *in-quiry?* Why not have asked the Duke, at the beginning, whether there was any truth in Mr. Wardle's charges, or not; and why not have produced a short note from him to *satisfy* us all, that the thing was false from beginning to end?——Neverthe-less, the report (in the Courier news-paper of the 18th instant) says, that Mr. Can-ning said, that the "Chancellor of the "Exchequer," Mr. Perceval, "was en-"abled to *prove,* on the *most unquestionable* "*authority,* that the Duke had furnished "Mrs. Clarke with the £. 16,760." So that, after all this work, the Duke's word is the best authority!——Mr. Fuller is reported to have spoken thus:——"What would "the house, or *the public,* wish for more, "than that £ 16,000 should be spent in "two years on such a baggage as this. "For his part he thought it might have "been seen from the shuffling way in "which she answered the first six ques-"tions put to her, that they ought not "to have proceeded with this silly and "foolish inquiry."——In the last part of his observations Mr. Fuller was right enough, if the Duke's word is to be op-posed to the evidence against him. Not only not more than six questions; but no question at all should have been put to Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke's word is to be opposed to her evidence.——Mr. Beres-ford, however, is reported to have observed, upon this very novel procedure, that "it "was needless to think, that, by shutting "their own eyes, the House *could also shut* "*the eyes of the public;*" and never did he make a truer observation in his life.—— Mr. Perceval was then examined thus: "*Question:*—Do *you know* if his Royal High-"ness paid any, and what sums, towards "keeping the house in Gloucester-place, "besides £. 1,000 a year allowed to Mrs. "Clarke?—*Answer:*—I know nothing of "the £. 1,000 a year but from the witness "at the bar. From *the Paper I now hold* "*in my hand,* I *see,* that from the 11th of "January, 1804, to the 18th of June, 1806, "£. 5,551 has been paid in drafts *(as the* "*certificate of the Duke of York at the bottom* "*states)* for the use of Mrs. Clarke. The "payments to the tradesmen are also ve-"rified *by the certificate,* and to the best of "my recollection and belief."——Lord Folkestone objected to this *hear-say* evi-dence *in favour* of the accused, when it had uniformly been rejected, if attempted to be used *against him.*——They now desist-ed; and they still left it, as the reader will receive it, the bare word of the Duke of York against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, corroborated by the magnitude of the ex-

tablishments in Gloucester Place and at Weybridge.———Mr. Cripps, however, whose question appears as *naturally as can be*, to have produced that "*diligent inquiry*" from Mr. Perceval that led to this curious procedure, was, it appears from the report of his speech, wonderfully well *satisfied* with the account of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.—"Mr. Cripps *thanked* the right "hon. gentleman for the information he "had given him. He would not have "made the enquiry till the end of the pre-"sent investigation, had *he not been aware* "*that very strong impressions had been made* "*on the public mind*, from the belief that "Mrs. Clarke was supposed to support her "expensive establishment on the allow-"ance of £. 3,000 for three years. The "answer was *most satisfactory*, and what-"ever might be the issue of this enquiry, "it must be a great consolation to his "Royal Highness to know, that without it, "it never would have been known to the "public in the manner unfolded *by Colonel* "*Gordon*, in how excellent and regular a "manner every thing *was conducted in the* "*Office of the Commander in Chief, so highly* "*to his honour, and so productive of benefit to* "*the British army.*"——Aye, aye, Sir! It was not necessary for you to state, that you were fully aware of the strong impression made on the public mind by Mrs. Clarke's evidence, though, if I forget not, some one or more did say, that she shuffled in such a manner, that *no one could possibly believe a word that she said.* We can have no doubt, Sir, that *you* are satisfied, because you say so; but, it does not follow, that *we* should be satisfied by so easy a method. ——And why, Sir, digress? why fly off from this soul-comforting statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and draw us after you, into observations upon the "ex-"cellent and regular manner," in which Col. Gordon shows "every thing is con-"ducted in the Office of the Commander "in Chief?" What has he shewn, Sir? That the dates of recommendations and of appointments and commissions are regularly entered, and that letters are neatly copied into books? Why, Sir, we know, that this office costs us, including the salaries and pensions of the Duke, *hundreds of thousands a year*; aye, hundreds of thousands; and, there is nothing there done, as far as appears from the evidence given to the House, that might not be done, and *full as well too*, by any four or five of the five hundred persons, who, by an advertisement in the news-papers, offering them £.150 a year a-piece, would be induced to offer their services before next Saturday night. This is my sincere opinion, and, if it can be shown to be erroneous, let it be done.——But, be this as it may; what has the *regular keeping of books* in the Duke's office to do with Mrs. Clarke's sale of commissions? what has it to do with the establishment and the vile traffic in Gloucester Place? This "regularity" did not prevent the officering of Samuel Carter, the concubine's foot-boy, as we shall see anon. Oh! this will never do. This is poor work. If Col. Gordon can bring proof, from his books or his boxes, that all that has been *proved* has *not been proved*; why, then, this able Colonel may be said to have afforded "great *consolation*" to his royal employer; but, if he cannot do that, it is even to undervalue the sense of the Duke to suppose, that, from what the Colonel has done, or can do, he will derive any consolation.——Before we return to our case, a remark or two is, by this digression, justified, and even called for, with respect to the evidence of all the *military officers*, and indeed, almost all the witnesses that have been called.——In courts of justice, the evidence of a brother, a father, or a very close friend, is always received with some portion of allowance for partiality. Persons, known to be in any-wise *dependant* upon the parties, are heard and believed with similar caution. There is no doubt, that my neighbour, or a stranger, is a better evidence for me than my own servant. The officers of the army are not the servants of the Duke of York; but, it is perfectly well known, that they are much more dependant upon him than any servant, considered merely as such, can *possibly* be upon any master. The worst I can do to a servant is to *turn him off*; but, the Commander in Chief can, with the approbation of the king, at any moment, *without reason assigned*, not only turn any officer off, but, by that very act, strip him of his *rank in life*, and of the means of obtaining *even bread to eat.* My discarded servant can go to another master; but, there is no other master, no other service for the cashiered officer to go to. For this reason, amongst others, it doubtless was, that sir Francis Burdett wished it to be enacted, that no officer should be discarded without being so sentenced by a court martial; a law the more necessary, because the office of Commander in Chief was held by *a son of the king*, by which means the advice as well as the power was concentrated in the throne.——I say not this with any wish to disparage the evidence of Colonels Gordon and Lo-

raine, or of any other of the military officers; but, I say it, with a view to shew to the public, that their evidence is not all to be taken for Gospel, merely on account of the rank they hold. Mr. French is a Colonel, and Mr. Clavering is a General. ——Let it be remembered too, in answer to what has been said about taking the Duke and his friends *by surprize*, that Mrs. Clarke's letters to Mr. Adam have been in his possession from *June last*. They were there apprized of her intended exposure. So that they have had *six* times as much *time* as Mr. Wardle, who became acquainted with the facts but a *month* before he brought forward his charges.——Having thus, cleared all the cases together of these unfair impressions scattered about amongst them, we will now return to that immediately under consideration.——The reader has had a view of the magnitude of the establishments in Gloucester place and at Weybridge; he is pretty well able to judge of their annual expences; he has Mrs. Clarke's evidence that she never got, from the pocket of the Duke, more than £. 1,200, or at most, more than £. 1,500, a year wherewith to defray those expences, when £. 1,000 a year was scarcely enough to pay wages and purchase liveries; he has her evidence, that the Duke, when she complained of her pecuniary embarrassments, told her *she had greater* INTEREST *than the Queen, and that she ought to use it;* and, he has, in the Duke's own hand writing, the *proof*, that she did interfere in promotions, and that he spoke to her of such things, as of things of course, witness the cases of General Clavering and Dr. O' Meara. Opposed to all this there is not one particle of evidence good or bad, unless the Duke's bare word; unless the bare word of the accused, be admitted as evidence. If however, the reader thinks that bare word sufficient to knock down such a body of evidence, he will, of course, have his doubts about the Duke's knowing that his concubine's establishments were partly supported by bribes given for commissions and the like; but, if the reader should be of a contrary opinion, his conclusion, without going into any of the particular cases of corruption, must be, that the Duke must have been all along fully aware, that the establishments were for the far greater part, supported by those corrupt and wicked means, and of course, that the expences attending his profligate pleasures were, in that same degree, ultimately defrayed out of taxes raised from the fortunes and labour of the people.

CASE OF KNIGHT AND BROOKE.

It is alledged, that, in July 1805, Col. or Lt. Col. (no matter which) Knight, wished to make an exchange of commissions with a Major, or a Lt. Col. Brooke; that the application of these two gentlemen had been, for some time, before the Duke of York; that it was not followed by the grant of the Duke to exchange; till, at last, Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Col. Knight, at the suggestion of Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), offered to Mrs. Clarke, through Doctor Thynne, the sum of £.200 if she would get the exchange accomplished; that Mrs. Clarke undertook the job; that she told the Duke of York that she was to be paid for it; that the exchange, in a few days afterwards, was ordered to take place and was actually gazetted; that, upon this, the fulfilment of the contract on her part, Mr. Knight paid her the £.200, and that she not only told the Duke, that the money had been paid her, but actually shew him the note or notes.

Dr. Andrew Thynne stated, that at the request of Mr. Knight he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke; that he was authorized to offer her £.200 if she would cause the exchange to be expedited; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person; that this great person was the Commander in Chief; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness, the Gazette, in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, £.200 would be very convenient to her; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper; that Mrs. Clarke talked about the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the £.200; that his brother had before received, from the office of the

Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that, when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked: "Why "was the application made to Mrs. "Clarke," he answered, "There was a "delay in the business; but the cause of "it I do not know. I mentioned the cir- "cumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then "attending my family. He advised me "to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. "Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.—— Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to keep the whole transaction a secret, *lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York;* and that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about £.2,000, she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke states, that in, or about, July 1805, Dr. Thynne applied to her to obtain leave for an exchange between Knight and Brooke; that he made her an offer of a pecuniary compliment; that she thinks the sum mentioned was a couple of hundred of pounds; that Dr. Thynne told her, at the time, that Mr. Knight had long been endeavouring to get this leave, but had not yet succeeded; that, on the same day, in which the proposition was made to her, she mentioned it to the Duke of York, and gave him, while at dinner, the slip of paper, which she had received from Dr. Thynne, containing the names of the parties; that the Duke asked her whether she knew the parties; that she answered that she did not know them at all, and that certainly they would make some sort of compliment, but that she is not certain that she mentioned the exact amount of the compliment; that, when the exchange appeared in the Gazette, she sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, together with a note from herself; that, in a day or two after that, she received the £. 200, which came to her in a note, with Dr. Thynne's compliments; that she thinks the compliments were written in the note; that she made this circumstance of the receipt of the money known to the Duke of York; that she did this on the day on which she received the money; that the Duke must have known the amount of the note, because she shewed it him, and she thinks that she got one of his servants to get it exchanged for her, through his Royal Highness.——Upon her cross-examination, she says, that she thinks she can say positively that the note, with the money in it, came from Dr. Thynne, because she told her maid to go down and give the man who brought it a guinea; that the Duke got the note changed for her, because she could not get it done herself; that she did not know any thing of the servant's name who was sent to get the note changed.——Being asked, whether she desired Mr. Knight to keep the matter *secret,* she says, she should think that she did certainly, but does not recollect, but it is very likely she did. Being asked, whether she ever expressed a wish that it should be kept a secret from the Duke; she says, "O no, never;" and that she is quite positive that she never said any thing like it. Being asked, what the Duke said, when she first opened the business to him and told him she was to receive a compliment; she says: "He told "me that he knew the business very "well, that they had been trying at it "some time, and that he thought one of "them was rather *a bad subject;* but he "would do it." Being asked what time of the year the transaction took place, she says: "The Duke was going down to "Weymouth on the night that I changed "the note, which was the reason that I "got the note changed; my servants "could not get it changed, and his ser- "vant got it changed for me. Lord Ches- "terfield's family was going down, and he "was going to be god-father to Lord "Chesterfield's child: it was the end of "July or the beginning of August."

Colonel Gordon, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says, in substance, this: that it is his duty to make to the Duke a report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an enquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the enquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other

than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July, 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.——In the course of his examination he produced an answer of his to a letter from Col. Knight (which answer was dated 21 June, 1805,) requesting leave to exchange, the answer stating that the Duke had no objection to the exchange, and that, when an *eligible successor could be recommended*, the request would be taken into consideration.——Col. Gordon also produced the following document contained in a letter from Greenwood and Cox, the agents of some of the parties, which document bears date, 1 July, 1805.

BROOKE'S SERVICES.

Cornet, 8 Dns. - -	29 June	93
Lieut. 83 F. - - -	7 Oct.	93
Capt. Ind. Co. - -	14 Dec.	93
——— 96 - - -	25 Mar.	94
Maj. - - - - -	13 Dec.	94
Placed on half-pay -	Mar.	98
Bt. Lt.-Colonel - -	1 Jan.	1800
Maj. - - 48 - - -	24 May	1804
Cancelled - - -	9 June	1804
Maj. - - 56 - - -	5 Jan.	1805

23 *July*, 05.

H. R. H. does now approve of this exchange.

C. L.

cannot be acceded to, H. R. H. does not approve of the exchange proposed.

Sir,

By direction of General Norton, we have the honour to inclose a form, signed by Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Brooke of the 56th regiment, to exchange with Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Knight of the 5th Dragoon Guards, together with a copy of a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Knight, stating, that he is satisfied with the security given for payment of the regulated difference between the value of the two commissions; and being informed the counterpart of the exchange has been sent in through the Agents of the 5th Dragoon Guards, you will be pleased to submit the same to Field Marshal His Royal Highness the Duke of York.——We have the honour to be, Sir, Your most obedient humble Servant, GREENWOOD & COX.

N. B.—Mark well, reader, the words in *Italics*, were, in the original produced, written in PENCIL!!!

Ludovick Orramin (who was called on a later day) a footman of the Duke of York, said, that he was a foreigner; that he had lived 18 years with the Duke; *that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's;* that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see; that the Duke was not then there; *that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed.* In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked *(previous to his coming to the House of Commons)* the same question about the note, by *the Duke*, by Mr. *Adam*, by Mr. *Lowten*, and by Mr. *Wilkinson*, and that he had given them the same answer.

David Pierson (who was called on a day after Orramin had given his evidence) was butler to Mrs. Clarke in 1805, and is now butler to the Honble. Mr. Turner. He states, that he recollects in 1805, the Duke going to Weymouth and Mrs. Clarke to Worthing; that, about that time, which was in hot weather, he saw Mrs. Favourite (Mrs. Clarke's house-keeper) bring down a bill, in the morning, and Ludowick going out and getting it changed, and coming back and giving it to Mrs. Favourite again, and she took it up stairs; that he does not know the amount of the note; that the Duke was up stairs at the time; that he is not certain whether the Duke was up or not; that this is the only note he ever recollects Ludowick's getting changed. ——*Pierson*, in a second examination, recollects, what he had forgotten before, that, on the night that the Duke of York went to Weymouth, about 11 o'clock at night, he himself was sent out to get a bill changed; that he went out and got it changed; that he brought the change to Mrs. Clarke, who said it was all right;

that the Duke of York was present both when he got the bill from his mistress and when he brought the change, that he got the bill changed at Byfield Bridgeman's; and that, to the best of his recollection, it was a bill of £.100.

Mr. Bridgeman states, that he recollects Pierson's bringing a note to be changed, about July 1805, and that Pierson said it was a note of £.100, but that the note was not changed.

Mrs. Favourite, the house-keeper of Mrs. Clarke, is asked: "Did you ever give "Ludowick a note to get changed?" Her answer is this: "I did; but I cannot say "what was the amount of the note. I "gave it him, he went out and brought "me the change. I brought up the change "to the bed-chamber, where his royal "highness and Mrs. Clarke were. In short "they were in bed."

Such is the evidence upon this case, and now let us see what it amounts to; let us examine into the quality of the separate parts; see how those parts correspond with each other; and how far the criminatory evidence is contradicted by the exculpatory.—FIRST (repeating, for a little, some former observations of mine,) it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne, *who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke*, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained: SECOND, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her £.200, in case the exchange should take place: THIRD, it is *proved*, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place: FOURTH, it is *proved*, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place, did receive from Mr. Knight the said sum of £.200. All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in *no danger themselves*, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a *bad subject*, but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the £.200, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servants, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, we must now take a view of the opposing evidence, beginning with what has been said as to her *general character*. Mr. Adam represents her as a woman, who, upon former occasions, had told contradictory stories, and, in particular, relating to her being a *widow* and to the place of *her marriage*. She had, it is asserted, stated herself to be a widow, had contracted debts under that character, and had afterwards, in a court of justice, got rid of the debts by pleading her marriage. Through the whole of the evidence there is no proof of her having *herself* represented that she was a widow, except in the case of a court-martial, where she had been called as a witness, and of this she gives the following explanation. Being asked: "Have you "not *sworn yourself to be a widow?*"—She answers: "His Royal Highness, a very "short time since, when I sent to him to ask "him to send me a few hundred pounds, sent "me word, that if I dare speak against him, "or write against him, he would put me "into *the pillory*, or into *the Bastille*. He "fancies that I *swore* myself to be a widow "woman when I was examined at a Court "Martial. But the Deputy Judge Advo- "cate had more feeling than the gentle- "man who has examined me now, he told "me I might say any thing out of the "Court which it might be unpleasant to "me to swear to; I told him it would be "very improper for me to say that I was "a married woman, when I had been "known to be living with the Duke of York. "I did not swear that I was a widow, I "said it out of Court, and *it was put into the "Court Martial Minutes as if I had sworn to "it, but it was not so.* The Judge Advo- "cate, to whom I told it, is at the door, and "I think he had better be called in, I know "now what he is come for."——This explanation of Mrs. Clarke is not at all contradicted by the evidence of the Deputy Judge Advocate, *Sutton*, who was called in on a subsequent day. He was asked, what passed, at the Court-Martial concerning Mrs. Clarke's being considered a widow; and he answered thus: "Having "been directed to summon Mrs. Clarke, "he applied to the Agent of Captain "Thompson, *who returned her as a widow*, "of Glouton Lodge, Essex. In conse-

"quence of such a description he admi-
"nistered the usual oath to Mrs. Clarke,
"who answered every question put to her,
"and upon that charge Capt. Thompson
"was acquitted. Was sure he took the
"description *from the Attorney*, and *that no*
"*interrogatory was put to her whether she*
"*was a widow or not.*"——Thus, then, she did *not* swear herself a widow, and that imputation against her falls to the ground.—There is one witness who says, that *her servant* did, indeed, represent her, upon one occasion, as a dashing, or gay, young widow; it appears, that she was trusted under the presumption of her being so; and, it is probable enough, that she wished to be so thought, for the purpose of obtaining credit, as well as for other purposes; but, there is no proof of her ever having represented herself as a widow, except in the case of the court-martial.——As to the charge relating to the place of her marriage, being asked: "Was it true or not,
"that you were married at Berkhamp-
"stead?"—She answers: "I tell you I
"told it him laughing; and I told the Duke
"I was *making a fool of him* when I said
"that; for which his Royal Highness said
"he was very sorry, *for that he was entirely*
"*in Mr. Adam's clutches.*"——To say the truth, there is very little in these allegations against her as a witness in this case. She would, from the nature of her situation, naturally wish to keep from the world the real facts relating to her family connections. To own poor relations; to lead our acquaintance down into our origin and to the low scenes whence we sprang, is not common; nor is it at all uncommon for people, even of unimpeachable veracity, to be weak enough to use all the arts of disguise in such cases.——During the examinations, it has been proved, I think, that she did *pass*, amongst some persons, for *Mrs. Dowler*. One witness says, that she *called herself* Mrs. Dowler; and she says, over and over again, that she never so represented herself, except in jest. There is little doubt of her having been looked upon, by some few people, as Mrs. Dowler; but, then, these two circumstances should be kept in view: first, that, with much pains to get at the fact, no one can be found to say, that, even when she was thought to be Mrs. Dowler, *any letter ever came to her in that name*, or in any other name than than that of *Mrs. Clarke*; and, secondly, that this charge of calling herself *Mrs. Dowler* is manifestly at war with the other charge of calling herself *a widow*. ——Much affected stress has been laid upon her having asserted, that she said she had seen Mr. Dowler *twice* since his return from Portugal, when it now appears, that, besides that twice, she had not only seen him, but *slept with* him, at Reid's Hotel in St. Martin's Lane; and, as the twice had also been stated by Mr. Dowler, *his* general veracity, too, is impeached upon the same ground. But, I put it to any man, to any human being, whether, in such a case, the *third* time would not, by him, have been kept out of sight as long as possible? When asked how often they had seen one another, they said *twice;* so they had; the answer was true *in words*, but it was false *in meaning*, because the meaning was that they had seen one another *no oftener than twice*. There was deception in the answer; there was a moral offence in it; yet, is there one man or woman in the whole world, who would not, in such a case, have been strongly tempted to commit that offence? The fact clearly appears to be this: that Mr. Dowler, who seems to be a very clever man, has, for years, been her paramour; that, in his society, she has sought for a compensation for the drudgery and the disgust and loathing experienced in the society of the Duke; and that, accordingly, upon the very first night of his return from Portugal, she flew to his embraces; a circumstance which human nature, which the decency retained even by the lowest of prostitutes, bid her, as long as possible, abstain from stating to the world.——Another observation upon the general complexion of her testimony is this: that, in several instances, where her assertions have been contradicted by others; and particularly in the cases of Ludovick and Gen. Clavering, proof has afterwards been brought of the *truth* of her evidence, and of the erroneousness, not to call it *wilful falshood*, of theirs.——She has been called, "*impudent baggage, infamous woman*," and the like; and it has been much dwelt upon, that she had *threatened vengeance* against the Duke of York. Now, as to *general character*, there can be no doubt, that a woman like Mrs. Clarke is not to be believed so soon as a woman of perfectly virtuous character. But, then, we must consider, that, whatever degree of turpitude we, on account of her way of life, attribute to her, must be shared by her keeper, by the person, whose society she so long dwelt in. If we conclude that *her* mind has been vitiated, *her* morals destroyed by such a course of life; bare justice bids us also conclude, that *his* mind and *his* morals have undergone the same

degree of ruin; and, of course, that whatever we, on this account, take from her credibility, we must, on the other hand, add to the probability of his doing that which is vicious.——It appears, as I once before observed, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Robert Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms; and, indeed, she does not deny this, nor could she *possibly have any intention of denying it*, because she knew, and said, that Mr. Adam had her letters to the same amount, which letters are inserted below*, and which letters, she must be quite sure, would not fail to be brought forth against any denial of her having threatened the Duke with an exposure. To an enraged woman (though, by the bye, to suppose her *enraged* we must suppose her ill-used); to an enraged woman, we may, as I before observed, allow a pretty large portion of vindictiveness; and, indeed, unsupported by other evidence, I should have no hesitation in saying, that she was not to be believed. Yet, I cannot help stating a case, bearing strongly upon this point, as to the principle of Evidence, which case occurred at the last Quarter Sessions held at Winchester.——Three men were indicted and tried for breaking into a barn and stealing wheat out of it. The *only* witness, to speak to *the fact itself*, was a common prostitute who, at midnight, had crept into a heap of straw, in the yard, to sleep. There were two women of her acquaintance, at the house of one of whom she had since resided, who gave evidence of some sus-

* Sir,—On the 11th May, 1806, you waited on me by the desire of His R. H. the Duke of York, to state H. R. H.'s intention of allowing me an Annuity of four hundred per annum. H. R. H. by His promise is now indebted to me five hundred pounds. I have written repeatedly, but of no avail. H. R. H.'s conduct towards me has been so devoid of principle, feeling, and honour; and as His promises are not to be depended on, though even given by you; I have come to the determination of making my intentions known to you, for the consideration of H. R. H.; —and thus it is:——I solicit H. R. H. to make the Annuity secure for my life, and to pay me the arrears immediately, as my necessities are very pressing (this he knows.)—If H. R. H. refuses to do this, I have no other mode for my immediate wants, than to publish every circumstance ever communicated to me by H. R. H. and every thing which has come under my knowledge during our intimacy, with all his letters; those things amount to something serious: He is more within my power than may be imagined. Yet I wish for H. R. H.'s sake and my own, that He will make my request good, as I know full well I should suffer much in exposing Him in my own mind; yet before I do any thing publicly, I will send to every one of H. R. H.'s family, a copy of what I mean to publish. Had H. R. H. only have been a little punctual, this request had never been made. One thing more: should H. R. H. throw up his protection to my Boy (for I thank Him much for the past) I hope He will place him on the foundation of the Charter-house or any other public school: the child is not accountable for my conduct. You will please then, Sir, to state this communication to the Duke of York; and on Wednesday I will send to your house, to know what may be H. R. H.'s intention; which you will please to signify by a letter to Your must obedient, humble servant,—M. A. Clarke.

Sunday morning, June 19.

His Royal Highness must feel, that His conduct on a late affair deserves all this from me, and more.

11 Holles Street, Cavendish-square.

Sir,—On Wednesday, finding there was not any answer to my letter, I am led to infer, H. R. H. the Duke of York thinks proper not to make good his promise given by you, and that you encourage him in it. I have employed myself since, in committing to paper every circumstance within my recollection during the intimacy of H. R. H. and myself. The fifty or sixty letters of H. R. H. will give weight and truth to the whole. On Tuesday I have promised to give these up, if I hear nothing further after this last notice; and when once given out of my own possession, it will be impossible to recall. It is to Gentlemen, and not any publisher they will be committed; and those Gentlemen are just as obstinate as His Royal Highness, and more independent: they are acquaintances of your's; and to relieve my wants, in pique to others will do what the Duke will not: however, He has it all within His own power, and so He may act as He pleases.—I am, Sir, Your most obedient, M. A. Clarke.

Saturday morning.

picious conduct of the prisoners, with respect to their tampering with the witness to get out of the way. But, there was, on the side of the prisoners, evidence going far towards proving an alibi with respect to one of them; another witness was brought, who said, that one of the prisoners having accused the girl of giving him the foul disease, she said *she would be up with him.* It was proved, too, that when before the magistrate, she had said, that she would *swear* to but one of the three prisoners. Yet, were they, upon the positive testimony of this one witness, and she a common prostitute, found guilty of the charge for which they had been indicted; and, I well remember, that the Chairman, Mr. Borough, a very clever man, and a lawyer of great experience, observed to the jury, that, though some allowance was to be made for the general character of the principal witness, yet her immoralities, of the sort alluded to, ought not to be considered as sufficient to cast any great degree of discredit upon her testimony, in a case where those immoralities could be supposed to have had little, or no, influence upon her conduct. Indeed, if evidence like this were rejected, how could crimes be punished? In, perhaps, four cases out of five, great guilt is established by the mouths of persons, in some degree, guilty. Vice punishes itself. If accomplices are not to be accusers; if their evidence is not to be taken, is it not manifest, that there is an end of that great check upon crimes; namely, *the fear of being betrayed?*——Submitting these more general observations to the consideration of the reader, I now return to the case immediately before us, bearing in mind, that the only question, which we have, in this case, to settle in our minds, is, whether the Duke of York did, or did not *know*, that Mrs. Clarke was concerned in, and took money for, the effecting of the exchange between Knight and Brooke.——We have her positive declaration, that he knew of *all* her proceedings in this way, which declaration is strongly corroborated by the Duke's own letters, wherein he so familiarly speaks to her of the requests of General Clavering and Dr. O'Meara, bidding her *tell the former* that he is mistaken in the ground of his application; and we have her declaration as to his knowledge of her practices in this case in particular —— Now, opposed to this, we have the testimony of Mr. Robert Knight, upon whose evidence, as thus opposed, I have only to repeat my former observations.——Mr. Knight, who, after the exchange got acquainted with Mrs. Clarke, says, that she desired him, to keep the matter *a secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason for this, her fear of the consequences, *if it should reach the Duke of York's ears.* This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who *took* the bribe, or Mr. Knight, who *gave* the bribe, and who first *tendered* the bribe? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *internal probabilities* of the case.——Mr. Knight was asked, *what part* of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and, whether it was solely the *money* part of it; he answered, that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke.* This question was put so often, and the reports in all the news-papers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.—— Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to *thank* Mrs. Clarke for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her £.200 for that influence; and, was it *probable*, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, *that she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York?* Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that *she took credit to herself for it;* but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's £.200 was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe, that Mrs. Clarke would say, "It was I who *prevailed upon the Duke* "to permit of your brother's exchange; "but for God's sake, *don't let the Duke* "*know of it.*" Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too preposterous to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*;

this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's *knowing* of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man with whom *she was taking credit to herself* for having obtained the grant *from the Duke*, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment entertained by any man in his senses.——As to the evidence of Ludovick about the getting the note changed, I before made these observations:—If what Ludovick Armor says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs. Clarke says about sending the note to change *must* be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falshood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any *reason* for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *shewed* the Duke the money would have answered full as well for all the purposes of accusation and of criminations. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falshood, except that of bringing forth Ludovick Armor; or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as aukward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.——These observations occurred to me before I had seen the examinations of Pierson and Mrs. Favourite; but, they have now put the matter beyond all doubt, that Ludovick's *memory*, though refreshed by questions, *before he came to the House*, put to him by the *Duke*, by Mr. *Adam* (one of the judges in this case), by Mr. *Lowten*, and by Mr. *Wilkinson*, did, upon this occasion, fail him.——Colonel Gordon's evidence has in it nothing *positive*. It speaks, indeed, to the general regularity of conducting business in the office of the commander in chief; the Colonel *firmly* believes, that he made his report, as usual, to the Duke as to the fitness of the exchange, though he *kept no minutes* of the inquiry, upon which the report was founded; and he has not the *smallest doubt*, that the Duke acted solely upon that report, unbiassed by any other influence whatever. For the Colonel's *opinions* we may have a very great respect, especially as he appears to have had so much to do with the illustrious personage, whose conduct was the subject of inquiry; but, with all due deference to the Colonel, *opinions* are not facts; nor will they, in the mind of any impartial man, weigh one grain against positive and corroborated testimony.——In his speech, stating the charges, Mr. Wardle, at the first opening of the business, stated the exchange of Knight and Brooke to have been concluded on the 25*th of July*. It now appears, that it was not *gazetted* till the 30th; and, observe, it has been attempted to be shewn, that the thing was done without the aid of Mrs. Clarke, because Colonel Gordon has produced a document to shew, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23*rd of July*, just as if Mr. Wardle had ever pretended to *name the day* when the application *was made to Mrs. Clarke!* He merely misstated the date of the gazette, a mis-statement which could not possibly be intentional, because there was the gazette to refer to. But, what is this document? What is this written proof, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23*rd of July?* Why, it is a document, in which the material part, the only words that are material, are found written in PENCIL! The exchange was not *gazetted*, it appears, till *seven* days after it was approved of by the Duke, though there must have been one gazetting day between; not till seven days after the Duke is, in *pencil*, stated to have approved of it. In *pencil*, reader, you will please to bear in mind; always keep in mind, that it was in *pencil*. I wonder what judges and juries would say of documents, of written evidence, partly in *pencil?*——Colonel Gordon states, however, positively, that the Duke of York went to Weymouth on the 31*st of July*; which is important, because the gazette, in which the exchange of Knight and Brooke appeared, was published on the 30*th of July*, and Mrs. Clarke says, that she received the £. 200 *before* the Duke went to Weymouth. This brings the whole of the operations, subsequent to the gazette, into a crowded space. She sent the gazette to Dr. Thynne; Dr. Thynne sent it to Mr. Knight; Mr. Knight sent her the money; she shewed the money to the Duke; and all this must, if true, have taken place, between some time in the day of the 30th, and some time in the night of the 31st, or in the morning of the 1st of August; that is to say, if Colonel Gordon be correct as to the day of the

Duke's setting off for Weymouth. Yet is there nothing, that I can perceive, at all incredible in this rapidity. If Mr. Knight got the gazette on the 30th, he would not, after the pressing note from Mrs. Clarke to Dr. Thynne, fail to send her the money the next day; on that day the Duke, before his departure, would naturally go, as the witnesses stated he did go, to Mrs. Clarke's; she would, if ever, then shew him the money; and, of course, if she got the note, or notes, or one of them changed, through him, that was the very time, when she would get it done. All the servants agree, that the Duke was there on the day, and in a part, at least, of the night previous to his departure for Weymouth, and Mrs. Favourite, perfectly corroborated by Pierson, says that she gave Ludovick a note to get changed; and she further says, that she took up the change and delivered it to the Duke and Mrs. Clarke in bed.——Now, reader, dismiss from your mind all prejudice; all bias; and ask yourself, whether it be possible for such a story as this is all through; so many concurrent circumstances, flowing from so many quarters, to unite by mere accident; or by any thing short of the power of one great and prevailing truth. Ask yourself, whether the evidence of Mr. Adam to character, and the evidence of Ludovick and Colonel Gordon to fact, is sufficient to weigh against all that has been laid before you in support of this charge.

CASE OF CAPT. MALING.

Mr. Wardle, when he brought forward his Charges, stated, that there was a man, in the office of Greenwood, the Agent, who had risen to the rank of *Captain* in the army without having ever done one day's military duty, and without having even joined any regiment. Upon the examination taking place in the House, it appeared, that Mr. Wardle had made a mistake; not, however, as to the nature of the case, or the name of the person; but as to the office in which that person was, it appearing, that the person was a clerk in the office of the Duke of York and not in that of Greenwood.——And here we have an instance of the manner, in which *Colonel Gordon* gave information to the House. When first called in, he was asked: "What were the merits and ser-"vices that obtained Capt. Maling his "rapid promotion, and the gift of his three "commissions?" His answer is; "*I will* "*state them to the House.*" He then goes on to shew, from documents in his possession, that he was recommended thus and thus, and that he had served thus and thus; and, though the promotion was very rapid indeed, and seems not to be accounted for upon the score of service, it does appear that the person in question had been engaged in actual military service. ——Upon this being made appear, Mr. Wardle was disposed to *withdraw* this charge: "No, no!" said the friends of the Duke. No. It shall not be withdrawn; it shall stand for us to decide upon it.——The *Colonel* was then examined as to other matters; and, before he was ordered to withdraw, it occurred to some one, that a mistake, as to the office, had been made; and the Colonel was asked: "What were the *services* "of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I "believe, a captain in the army, who is "in the war-office?"——Now, mark the answer; mark this answer well. "*There* "*is a Captain Maling*, an assistant of mine, "in the office of the Commander in Chief; "I *take for granted* that is the person re-"ferred to. What his services are as a "Lieutenant I really do not know; I "found him as a Lieutenant in the office "of the Commander in Chief; and in "consideration of his *extraordinary good* "*character*, and *more than common abilities*, "the promotions of the army going through "his hands *under mine*, I did recommend "him to His Royal Highness the Com-"mander in Chief, to be placed *upon the* "*half-pay as a Captain*, upon which half-"pay he most assuredly will be placed as "soon as an opportunity offers; but the "Commander in Chief has it not in his "power."——He is then asked: "Do "you know whether, or not, that Captain "Maling ever joined, or did duty with, "any regiment?"—His answer is: "I do "not *know* that he did; and I do not *think* "that he did."——Whence we may conclude, with perfect safety, that he never did; so that the charge of Mr. Wardle is completely established, the circumstance of a mistake in the office being of no importance at all.——This is a case, which involves no direct pecuniary corruption; but it is worthy of as much attention as any one of the whole; for here, we see, that the offices of the army have been made *sinecures*, and, if this be tolerated, let the reader judge to what a length it may be, and, perhaps, already has been, carried, in an establishment consisting of from 12,000 to 15,000 commissioned and staff officers. I, in my last, observed upon the consequences of *leaves of absence*; I noticed

th particular case of the *younger Sheridan;* but, what must we expect if the rank and *pay*, as military officers, are given to clerks in offices? If to clerks, why not to any who are not clerks? Why not to butlers and footmen? Why not to any body? There is no knowing where the terrible abuse will terminate.——This man *never joined* any regiment? Yet he must be a Captain of some company in some regiment, and, perhaps, in one of those regiments which were serving in Spain. Is not this pretty encouragement for officers who actually do serve? Is not this a shameful injury to that service, for which the people so dearly pay?——He has been thus promoted for his "extraordinary good character, and *more than common abilities.*" Abilities in *what?* In what; why, "the *promotions* of the army "going through his hands *under mine,*" says the Colonel, with singular modesty. But, what have these abilities; this more than common abilities in copying letters, filling up blank commissions, and making memorandums, in *pencil*, in the margin of applications; what have these "more than "common abilities" to do with military command, which demands not only abilities of quite a different description, but requires also the *presence* of the person *with the army*. Besides, has not Captain Maling his *salary* as a clerk? Aye, and a salary, too, quite adequate to his services. We pay him that salary, and he ought not to be suffered to step in and take military rank and pay from men, who *venture their lives* for their country. He lies snug at the Horse Guards, while the person, who is supplying his place in the regiment, the person who is doing that duty for which Captain Maling has rank and pay, has his head exposed to the sabre or the bayonet of the enemy. Can there be an instance, more complete than this, of crying injustice? Is it *possible* that the real officers of the army should be content under such a system of distributing the benefits of rank and pay? Is it possible, that an army, thus treated, should be what it ought to be? And, is it not impudence unparalleled, to praise the management of the army, while such a case as this stands recorded in evidence, at the bar of the House? Oh! Colonel Gordon! Colonel Gordon, you who require a man of "*uncommon abilities*" to manage the promotions "*under* you;" what do you think would be the answer of the Emperor Napoleon, if his war-minister were to say to him: "There is a man who is uncommonly "clever at filling up blank-commissions "and making memorandums and copying "letters; and, *therefore*, I would recommend him to your Majesty as a mightily "proper person to command a company "of foot, letting him still remain a clerk "in my office?" What do you think would be, in such a case, the answer of Napoleon?——It is not thus that *triumphings* are managed, Colonel Gordon.——But, observe, the curious account that the Colonel gives of what was intended to be done with this Captain Maling of "uncommon abilities." He recommended him, he says, to the Commander in Chief, to be placed upon *half*-pay as a Captain. But, he *is* upon *full*-pay! The Duke, he tells us, has not the power to place him upon *half*-pay; but he has had the power to place him upon *full*-pay, where he now is! Oh! wonderously fine regulations! Oh! the "excellent *regularity*" of conducting things in the office of the Commander in Chief! I am delighted with this idea of "regularity." It does form, as Mr. Cripps seemed to think, such a famous set-off against all the thumping charges relating to jobbing and corruption.

CASE OF FRENCH AND SANDON.

This case opens to us a most extensive field of corruption and profligacy. In the evidence, relating to this case, we have a view of the whole system; and, therefore, it is worthy of particular notice, not only in its substance, but in the whole of its detail.——It is proved by documentary evidence, that, on the 30th of April, 1804, *Colonel French* and *Capt. Huxley Sandon* obtained a Letter of Service, as it is quaintly called; or, in plain English, an authority, to raise 5,000 men for the army; and that this authority, and bargain, was granted and made through the power of the Commander in Chief, the transaction being one that originated in his office.——The proposition of a *loan* to the Duke comes out incidentally.

Capt. Huxley Sandon states, that a Mr. Cockayne, his attorney, having told him, that if he wanted any thing done at the War-office, he knew a person who could do it, he was led to the transaction in question, in conjunction with Col. French; that there was an agent of Mrs. Clarke, a Mr. Corri, a music-master, who was to introduce them; that the original bargain was, that Mrs. Clarke was to receive £. 525, and Mr. Corri £. 200 for the in-

troduction, the former sum to be increased, at his discretion, if they were successful in their levy, to £.2,000.

Mr. Corri states, that Sandon did apply to him, and commissioned him to offer Mrs. Clarke £. 2,000 for her assistance; that he, in consequence, did apply to Mrs. Clarke; and that, in June, 1804, he received two hundred pounds for himself, from Sandon, which £.200 he gave to Mr. Cockayne, to whom he was in debt.

Mr. Dowler states, that he saw Col. French and Capt. Sandon at Mrs. Clarke's; that, by desire of Mrs. Clarke, he spoke to them, several times, upon the subject of the levy; that Mrs. Clarke told him, that she was to receive 1,000 guineas, and *a guinea a man*, until the levy of 5,000 men should be completed. To this he adds:—"I was also present when Colonel "French or Captain Sandon, I don't know "which, gave Mrs. Clarke £.500 of it. I "afterwards saw Colonel French at Mrs. "Clarke's, when he stated to her, that it "was not possible to procure the number "of men at the usual bounty, and *begged* "*that the number of boys should be increased* "in the levy, which, as I understand, was "afterwards done."—Upon being asked what cause she assigned for doing such things, he says: "She said the Duke of "York was so distressed for money that "she could not bear to ask him for any, "and that *that was the only way by which* "*she could support her establishment.*"

Mr. Grant (agent to Colonel French and Capt. Sandon's levy) states, that French and Sandon told him that they had got the levy through the influence of a friend, which friend he afterwards found to be Mrs. Clarke; that they told him this; that he understood she was to receive 500 guineas at first, and afterwards a guinea a man for every man raised; that he was told, by French and Sandon, that she actually received several sums from them; that he accepted a bill of £.200; that they told him they had actually paid her £.1,700; that he recollects that *Colonel French* applied to him about *a loan* of £.5,000 *to the Duke of York*, but that he took no steps upon it; that he recollects, that an observation was made, that it might be advanced, provided the arrears of the levy were paid up by government, but does not recollect, whether the observation came from himself, or from Col. French.

It was now [illegible] when Mr. Grant's examination [illegible], nearly two o'clock in the morning of the 8th of February, and, upon the propriety of calling Mrs. Clarke, the following very interesting and *memorable* discussion took place in the House, as reported in the news-papers.——Lord Folkestone called the attention of gentlemen to the exhausted state of the hon. member who brought forward the motion, the state of the House, and the lateness of the hour, and proposed an adjournment. —(*A cry of "Go on! go on!"*)—Mr. Perceval observed, that many Members appeared to be impressed with the belief that the purposes of justice required that Mrs. Clarke should be examined to night, and in that sentiment he was much inclined to concur. As justice was the object of all, he hoped that Mrs. Clarke would be called in and examined. Without her evidence, the whole that had been said was nothing, as the Duke of York had not been implicated.—Mr. Wardle said that the right hon. gentleman need not have so strongly urged upon him *a regard to justice.* If the Committee thought that justice required it, he was ready to proceed. —*Mrs. Clarke was then ordered to be called.* —Mr. Wharton (the Chairman) stated that Mrs. Clarke was so exhausted that she begged to be indulged with a chair. [A chair was accordingly ordered.] He then said, that he found from the Serjeant at Arms, that he had mis-stated the message, which was a request from Mrs. Clarke that she might not be examined to-night. Mrs. Clarke, however, was called in. She stated that she had attended for eight hours, that her feelings had been excessively harassed during this examination; and that she was so excessively fatigued that she could not give her evidence to-night.—The Chairman told her, that the Committee, in consideration of her fatigue, had ordered a chair for her. —Mrs. Clarke—"*A chair will not relieve the fatigue of my mind.*"—The witness was then ordered to withdraw.—Mr. Yorke adverted to the necessity, with a view *to the purposes of justice*, that the witness should be examined, lest some undue communication with the witnesses already examined should take place. He thought, therefore, that she ought to be examined, *or kept in the custody of the Serjeant at Arms*, and none of these witnesses admitted to her presence till the House met again. He did not know but there might be precedents for keeping witnesses in this way. —The Speaker said that there were certainly no such precedents in modern times, and the House ought to pause before they

came to a decision upon a point in which the liberty of the subject was so much concerned.—Mr. SHERIDAN said that after what the witness had said under circumstances that certainly added weight to her assertion, it was impossible for the Committee to proceed to the examination. The idea on the other hand, of locking her up, was contrary to every principle of propriety. The only remaining course was to do neither; and this was an inconvenience incident to their proceedings. Gentlemen ought to recollect, that justice was concerned in her giving her testimony in a state in which she could give it properly; and unless the House took care that this should be done, they would be considered rather as Parties than as Judges.—Mr. WARDLE read a note from Mrs. Clarke, requesting that he would come to her, as she was extremely indisposed.—Mr. ADAM said, that in the dilemma to which they were reduced there appeared no proper mode of acting but agreeing to postpone the examination, and to allow any communication with the other witnesses to go to her credit.—Mr. CANNING agreed in what had been said by the last speaker, but added that she might learn in the interval what the other witnesses had said without any direct communication, and the only way to bring this to a question of credit, was to call her now, and ask her whether any such communication had taken place. To this point she could undoubtedly answer, however much exhausted.—Mr. WHITBREAD conceived that the House would best consult its dignity, by allowing the hon. member to pursue the course of proceeding which he had a right to act upon. But even though it was unwilling to accede to such a principle, he begged leave to ask the House, whether a female, in attendance *for eight hours*, and of course suffering much suspense, had not some claim upon the generous feelings of the House, without any reference to the immediate person to whom that feeling was extended. To speak under such circumstances of committing Mrs. Clarke, he trusted would not meet the support of any man in that House. *(Hear, hear!)*—Mr. CANNING deprecated any such severity, *(Hear, hear!)* at the same time that he was alive to the necessity of putting certain questions to Mrs. Clarke, relative to any communication which she might have received from any of the witnesses examined that night. He still thought that a more preferable method might be pursued, to which on any side he could see no objection, namely, to call Mr. Dowler again to the bar, and examine him relative to any communication with that lady.—*(Hear, hear, from all sides.—Mr. Dowler was then called to the Bar.)*—He stated that the only communication he had with Mrs. Clarke, since he had left the Bar, was an acquiescence with her wish to procure for her some refreshment. He had abstained from any conversation, not from any advice communicated to him, but from a consciousness that it was the line of duty which he ought to pursue under such circumstances.

Mrs. Clarke (the proceedings being resumed) states, that French and Sandon did apply to her for the levy, but, though she has read the news-papers, she cannot perfectly call to her mind the sums she received from them; that they certainly promised her a pecuniary reward; that, in consequence of that promise, she applied, in their behalf, to the Duke, that she informed the Duke that she was to receive a pecuniary compensation; that the Duke, upon this, promised that the parties should have the levy; that she recollects one sum of £.500 that she received, which went in part payment of a service of plate for the house in Gloucester Place; that the Duke told her he paid the remainder of the money for the plate; that the parties did apply to her for alterations in the conditions of the levy, and that she always gave their notes to the Duke, but did not always know what they meant; that French told her, that if the Duke would pass his accounts, which were correct, and expected to have been passed some time before, he and his agent would *accommodate him with a loan of* £. 5,000, on proper security and at legal interest; that she spoke of this to the Commander in Chief; that the Duke said, that he could not demand money from the different officers, that besides, that it was a delicate business, as the thing might be known; that the loan was not made.

Miss Taylor was next called, and, as her evidence is of such very great importance, I shall give in the question and answer, as I find it reported in the Morning Chronicle.

BY MR. WARDLE.

Were you in the habit of visiting at Gloucester-place when Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke of York?—Frequently.

Have you ever heard the Duke of York

speak to Mrs. Clarke relative to Colonel French's levy?—Once.

Relate what passed at that time.—The Duke's words were, as nearly as I can recollect, "*I am continually wearied by Col.* "*French about his levy. He is always want-*"*ing something more to be done in his favour,* "*How does he behave to you, Darling?*"

Does the witness recollect any thing further passing than what she has stated?—Mrs. Clarke replied, "*Middling; not* "*very well.*"

Was that the whole of the conversation?—No.

Relate the rest.—The Duke said, "*Mas-*"*ter French must mind what he is about, else* "*I will soon cut up him and his levy* "*too.*"

By the Attorney General.

How long have you known Mrs. Clarke?—Ten years.

Not longer?—I cannot exactly recollect.

Where did you know her first?—At her house at Bayswater, near the Gravel Pits.

Where do you live yourself?—At Chelsea.

With whom did you live when you first knew Mrs. Clarke?—With my parents.

What was your father?—A Gentleman.

Do you live with her now?—No.

Is he living?—Yes.

Is your mother living?—Yes.

Do you live with her?—No.

With whom do you live?—With my sister.

Is she married?—No; she is a single woman.

Where resident?—At Chelsea.

In a lodging or a house?—In a house.

In what line of life is she?—She keeps a boarding-school.

In what part of Bayswater did Mrs. Clarke live?—She lived in Craven Place.

Who lived with her?—Her husband.

Did he always live with her?—He did when first I knew her.

Did you know any other person to live with her?—Yes.

Whom?—His Royal Highness the Duke of York.

Do you not know that she has lived with other persons since?—Not to my knowledge.

Are you intimately acquainted with her?—Yes.

Not related to her?—My brother is married to her sister.

Did you know her at Tavistock-place?—Yes.

Did her husband live with her there?—I never saw him there. I understood that Mrs. Clarke lived in Tavistock-place with her mother.

What time elapsed between her leaving her husband and her living with the Duke of York?—I cannot recollect.

How long ago since she knew Mrs. Clarke at Bayswater?—About ten years.

Had her husband left her before she left Bayswater?—I do not know.

Are you prepared to stand by that?—Yes.

What was her husband?—I always understood him to be a man of some fortune.

Do you not know that he had only £.50 annuity, and that paid weekly?—No.

Did you ever see her husband with her during the latter part of the period she lived at Bayswater?—No.

Where did she go to reside from Bayswater?—I do not recollect.

Does the witness recollect her living in Park-lane?—Mrs. Clarke called upon her one day and said she lived then in Park-lane.

Did you ever live with her in Tavistock-place?—I never lived with her at all.

Did you never sleep in the house?—Yes, frequently.

Do you know that any body lived with her, but her husband?—Yes.

You took her then for a modest decent woman?—She lived with her mother, and I knew nothing then to the contrary.

What is your father's name?—The same name as mine.

His Christian name?—James.

Where does he live now?—I should rather be excused answering.

A Debate intervened here, of which I shall give the report, from the same paper.——Lord Folkestone said that the whole of the learned gentleman's examination appeared to be for the purpose of catching the witness tripping. As to any reference to the investigation, he could see none in the question which the witness expressed her unwillingness to answer.——The Attorney General defended the propriety of his examination. A person was produced, of whom no person knew any thing, unless that she was the sister-in-law of a very questionable witness. In such a case was not inquiry into the character and connexions of such a witness necessary? Would not much of her character for credit, *depend upon a knowledge of the situation of life* in which herself and her connections moved? *(No! no!*

Order! order!) He by no means insinuated that poverty or humility of life were to be construed into objections against the validity of statements, where the persons making them had *uniformly supported a good character;* but he had still a right to contend that when persons wholly unknown, except by the good accounts they gave of themselves, were brought forward upon serious inquiries, he or any other Member had a right to inquire into every circumstance of their previous life, and of their connexions.——Gen. STEWART begged to say one word, viz. that if there was one Member who took up more of the time of the Committee by numerous questions, it was the Noble Lord (Folkestone) opposite.——Lord FOLKESTONE. If he had taken up the time of the Committee unnecessarily, he would feel extreme regret. At the same time that he could not surrender his own opinion, that the Attorney General's examination did not at all bear upon the point. Indeed, from his own observations, it was obvious that the only thing he pretended to know about that witness, he could not know, namely, that she was the sister-in-law of Mrs. Clarke, as he asserted, but which she denied.——Sir G. WARRENDER supported the propriety of the questions put by his Noble Friend (Folkestone)—they were, in his opinion, of the most vital importance.——Mr. SHERIDAN trusted that unless the Attorney General felt the absolute necessity of the question, he would not trespass on the private feelings of the witness by continuing to press it.

BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

I must repeat my question. Where is your father now?—I do not know.

BY MR. PERCEVAL.

Does the witness mean to *rest her credit* upon the veracity of that answer?

Mr. BRAND. There may be circumstances of real and serious difficulties, where it would be inconsistent with the best feelings of the heart, and a violation of parental duty, not to deny the residence of a father. The question may be a legal one, but he trusted, other motives of equal urgency would operate on the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to press it.——The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER conceived, That honourable gentleman had assumed difficulties, which he had no right to do. He could only attribute the disinclination of the witness to state certain circumstances, to her anxiety to evade that discovery, which would be fatal to the credit of her testimony.——Mr. WILBERFORCE had a strong objection to the *manner* in which the question was put, it appeared like BROWBEATING THE WITNESS. He by no means attributed such an intention to his right hon. friend, although a system may be contracted from legal habits. He recommended that the answer of the witness should be left to the opinion which the Committee would subsequently pronounce.——Mr. KENRICK stated, that he had heard from another person, that the person to whom the question referred, had been arrested within a few hours.——Mr. YORKE justified the question, as put by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Every means should be exerted to ascertain the character of the persons produced in support of those accusations. If such vigilance was not exercised, *street-walkers* from off the Strand, would probably be introduced at the bar of that House to criminate the character of the Duke of York.

EXAMINATION RESUMED.

When did you see your father last?—About a fortnight ago.

Where did he live last?—At Chelsea.

In what street?—I do beg to decline answering.

For what reason?—I do not like to tell so large an assembly where I live.

What objection can you have to tell where yourself and sister live, representing yourselves, as you do, to keep a boarding-school?—I stated my reasons before.

What fears have you from so large an assembly?—They will find me to be poor, and will therefore doubt my veracity.

MR. PERCEVAL.

Be assured your veracity will not be doubted on account of your poverty.—I live at No. 8, Cheyne-row, Chelsea.

Do you and your sister keep a boarding-school?—My sister and I do.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Did you often see Mrs. Clarke in company with the Duke of York?—Yes.

How often?—I cannot recollect; three weeks seldom passed but I did.

How long have you kept the boarding-school?—Two years and a half, altogether, in Kentish-town and Chelsea.

When you were at Kentish-town, where did your father live?—I have an objection to say any thing about my father.

Where did witness live at the time she heard his royal highness speak to Mrs. Clarke about Colonel French?—Cannot positively say; but that it was before she

went to live at Kentish-town.

Where did you live before that?—At Islington, to which place we went from Bayswater.

What part of Islington?—Dalby Terrace.

Do you know Mr. Wardle?—Yes.

How long?—Two or three months.

At whose request do you attend here to-night?—At Mrs. Clarke's.

Did you ever see Mr. Dowler at Gloucester-place?—Yes.

Did you ever see him in company with the Duke of York?—No.

Did you ever hear from Mrs. Clarke, that she introduced Mr. Dowler to the Duke of York as her brother?—No.

Do you believe your father's affairs to be in a state of embarrassment?—Yes.

Mrs. Hovenden (who is proved to have been a regular trader in commissions and the like) being called on a subsequent day, respecting the affair of Col. Shaw, and being incidentally asked about *Miss Taylor*, states, that she saw her *once* with her brother Capt. Taylor; that of her own knowledge, she can say nothing of Miss Taylor's reputation; that she did once say, that she should not return her visit, as she had heard *something unpleasant*. Being put to the test as to what this unpleasant thing was, she says: "Being "hear-say, I believe, I should not tell "what I hear. I *know nothing of myself.*" She was then asked: "Of your own "knowledge of Miss Taylor, would you "believe her evidence?" She answers: "I declare I do not see how I can answer "such a question as that. It is mere "matter of opinion. I cannot say." Being asked how her delicacy permitted her to *visit* Mrs. Clarke, she answers, that she did not *visit* her; she went to her on *business*.——Mr. Whitbread observed here, that, from what he had seen of the two ladies, he should be inclined to ask Miss Taylor *her* opinion of Mrs. Hovenden.

Pierson, the butler, is asked, whether he recollects to have seen Miss Taylor at the house in Gloucester-place. He states that he saw her there very frequently, and that she dined there often; but, that he does not recollect her dining there when the Duke did.

Thomas Walker, late coachman to Mrs. Clarke, saw Miss Taylor frequently at Gloucester-place.

Mrs. Favourite, the house-keeper, states that Miss Taylor very frequently visited at Gloucester-place, and when the Duke of York was there.

There is no need at all of adding Mrs. Clarke's testimony to that of this crowd of witnesses as to the fact of Miss Taylor being upon terms of intimacy at Gloucester Place, and of her being frequently there at the same time with the Duke; but, as Miss Taylor's evidence is of such vast weight; as it goes to the very vitals of this case, and, indeed, by corroboration, of all the cases, we must not omit a record of the following occurrence, which took place on the 17th instant.——Mr. Wardle stated that he had that morning received a letter from Miss Ann Taylor, complaining of the conduct of another witness, which he asked permission to read. The hon. gentleman then read the letter to the following effect:—"Sir,—I understand "that Mrs. Hovenden, on her examination "at the Bar of the House of Commons, stated that she had not returned me a visit I "paid her, in consequence of some imputation upon my character. In contradiction "to that, I have to state *that she visited "me twice*; once at Bayswater, and again "at Dalby Terrace. She also said she "would not entrust me with a child of "hers, but yet *she sent her niece, of 14 years "of age, to visit me.* I am, &c.—Ann "Taylor.——Mr. William Smith begged leave to recal the attention of the Committee to the letter produced by an honourable member, and signed "Ann "Taylor." If there was any proceeding in the course of this business, marked with peculiar and *unmerited harshness*, towards an individual, it was in the treatment this poor unprotected girl had met with. *(Hear, hear! from several members!)* There could be *nothing more unjustifiable*. The only shadow of disgrace that attached to this girl's conduct, as far as fell within the knowledge of the Committee, was her knowing such a .... The Chancellor of the Exchequer rose to order. The hon. gent. was, in his opinion, pursuing a most disorderly course. He might, if he pleased, call the witness to the Bar to disprove any evidence that had been given which she conceived to be inimical to her, but he could not enter into the discussion of the hardships she had undergone. If he had been inclined to do this, *he ought to have done it at the time she was examined*, when the impression was fresh in the minds of every one, and not at such a distance of time, when it was likely to provoke reply, and retard more material business. For if the honourable gentleman was allowed to go into this argument, those who were accused of imposing the hardships complained of would have

an equal right to defend themselves, and thus the time of the house would be consumed.——Mr. Smith contended that, the letter being read, he had taken the most proper time to ask if any proceedings were to follow upon it.——Why, Mr. Perceval, this was "*material business;*" it was by far more material than the inquiry about the *alledged forgery!* Aye, or the statement about the sums, which *the Duke says* he expended upon Mrs. Clarke's establishment! Aye, a vast deal more *material* than either. Mrs. *Hovenden*, the regular trader, was called upon for her opinion of Miss Taylor's *credibility;* if what Miss Taylor now states be true, that which Mrs. Hovenden stated even respecting her opinions of Miss Taylor, is false; and, sir, the people, are, I can assure you, all alive as to the credibility of Miss Taylor.

Having now stated the substance of the oral testimony, it only remains to be observed, that Colonel Gordon came again, with an abundance of documents, and most clearly proved, that, with respect to the levy of French and Sandon, *all was* PERFECTLY REGULAR *again in the books at the War-office, and in the office of the Commander in Chief.* The reader is, indeed, told, by Sandon, one of the principals, that he made a bargain with Cockayne to give Corri £.200 for an introduction to Mrs. Clarke, and that a bargain was made with Mrs. Clarke to give her a sum in cash, and a guinea a man, for the letter of service; he is told by Corri that he got the £.200; he is told by Dowler that he saw French and Sandon give Mrs. Clarke some of the money; he is told by Grant, the agent to the levy, that French and Sandon told him, that they paid her in all, £.1,700; he is told by Mrs. Clarke that the Duke granted the letter of service upon her telling him that she was to have money for it from French and Sandon; and, lastly, he is told by Miss Taylor, whose character and credibility remains unimpeached, that she heard the Duke say to Mrs. Clarke, that he was continually wearied by French about his levy, who was always wanting something more to be done in his favour! that she then heard the Duke ask Mrs. Clarke, how French *behaved to her*, and, upon Mrs. Clarke's replying: "middling, not very "well," the Duke said: "Master French "must mind what he is about, else I will "soon cut up him and his levy too." All this the reader is told by witnesses, for the far greater part, *unwilling* ones. If he regards the *regularity* of Colonel Gordon's books as sufficient to destroy all this evidence, then he must acquit the Duke; but if he does not, he must conclude that the Duke is guilty.

With the above cases (enough, probably, for one week's reading) I shall, for the present, content myself, especially as there appears to be fresh matter still coming forward, connected with some of the other cases.——In my next I shall continue the *analysis*, and never quit it till every case is fairly before my readers, and safely placed beyond the power of oblivion, or of misrepresentation.——There will also be to be performed another task of this sort, to wit, an analytical view of *the conduct of the House of Commons*, upon this important occasion. It will require much time and patience to go over the whole of the proceedings, draw together and to put upon record, the conduct and sentiments of the different members who have taken part in the discussions. Yet, this is absolutely necessary to be done.——In the mean while, there is one particular debate, which has arisen, incidentally, out of these proceedings, and which debate calls for immediate attention, as involving statements and principles of a general and very interesting nature. I would beseech the reader to bear in mind, that it is not merely the conduct of the Duke of York that is now before the public, but *that system of corruption*, of which the facts, now brought to light, now *dragged* out by the hair of the head, after having been discovered by accident; that system of corruption and of public robbery, of which these facts are but a *mere specimen*. This the reader should always bear in mind. He never should, for one moment, lose sight of this object. He should have it continually before his eyes.——The debate, to which I have alluded, and which I shall give as I find it reported in the news-papers, relates to *the treatment received by Mr. Wardle from the House*, at the out-set of, and during the investigation.——On the 15th instant, at the opening of the day's proceeding, Lord Folkestone said: "I do most sincerely hope, that this House will remember, and that the country will never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle), and happy am I in calling him my friend, was not allowed the course of proceeding in this investigation which he had originally determined upon, but was forced into the line of conduct which was recommended by the personal friend, and *professed adviser*, of the accused. I believe, upon reference to any

former parliamentary proceedings, or, indeed, upon a review of all the forms and precedents of any judicial inquiry, this case will be found the only one where the person originating the charges was denied to take the course he wished, particularly when that course was neither incompatible with the forms of the tribunal to which he appealed, or inconsistent with the justice that was required. Let the House also recollect, and the country never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle) has been pressed day after day, nay, hour after hour, to the prosecution of his charges, without intermission, or even time to prepare the necessary arrangements. Nor has he until within these few days, that I felt it my duty to offer to him my services, had the power of employing any agent to assist him in his arduous but honourable pursuit.—No, on himself alone has depended every exertion to meet the pressing desire on the other side of the House, of proceeding without the slightest relaxation. He has not been able to avail himself *of the services of a Lowten* or *a Wilkinson to arrange his documents, and to marshal his witnesses*. Let the House also recollect, and I hope the country will never forget, that my honourable friend has prosecuted this accusation under an express *threat of infamy*, contingently attaching to him, a threat virulently and acrimoniously urged *(hear! hear!)* which has been repeated and re-echoed by more than one member in this House, and which up to this moment has never been withdrawn, never rejected, nor even modified. It is under these circumstances, first refused the course of proceeding which he desired, next pressed without intermission, and under the terror of a menace, that my hon. friend has followed up the charges which he has so manfully introduced. These general observations I have thought it necessary to premise, conceiving, as I do, that in the proceedings of this inquiry my hon. friend has not been fairly used.——[His lordship then came to the business of *Kennet's loan*, and, in stating the difficulties, which he had met with in getting at the papers relating to it, he said that the person who had those papers was afraid of offending the government in bringing them forward. His lordship's words were these]—But the gist of his objection was, that *as the defence of the Commander in Chief appeared to be taken up as a ministerial measure*, he was apprehensive that he would incur their displeasure, and the displeasure of those immediately under them, which would probably operate to *the ruin of himself and his family*. I hear some murmurs of disapprobation from gentlemen in this House, but I do assure them that this is not the only case where similar apprehensions have prevented persons in possession of strong testimony from coming forward, *particularly officers in the army*, and where information was withheld, from the manner *in which it was taken up by the king's servants in that House*.——

——Mr. Perceval said, the noble lord had been particularly strenuous in calling on the House, and on the country, to hold the way in which the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had been treated in opening this business, and the way in which the noble lord himself had been treated, yesterday, in everlasting remembrance. If so, he (Mr. Perceval) hoped it would also be held in correct remembrance. The noble lord was correct in saying, that it was the anxious wish of gentlemen on that side of the House, out of regard, not to their own feelings only, but to those of the royal Duke, that every thing should be as fair, open, and public as possible. But did it from thence follow, that the mode of proceeding, which had been followed, had been forced on the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle)? Except the noble lord himself there was not a dissentient voice in that House against the mode of proceeding which had been followed. The plan adopted, therefore, was not one pressed on the hon. mover (Mr. Wardle), or on the House, by his hon. friend (Mr. Adam), or himself, but was one on which there was not a contrary opinion, but in one or two instances, in the House. A gentleman behind him had opposed the mode adopted for the very reason, if he at all understood the opinions of the noble lord and the hon. mover of the Inquiry, that they would have supported it, namely, that it was too public a mode of investigation, not, as it was now insinuated, that it was calculated to obstruct public justice. If his memory, however, did not fail him, the hon. gent. himself had not stated, that he wished for a Select Committee, but only for a Committee. The noble lord had indeed proposed a Select Committee; but no reluctance had been shewn by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) to the mode of proceeding since adopted. It had not been pressed on him reluctantly, but had been acquiesced in by the unanimous and consentient voice of the House. Was it then fair conduct to be observed towards any member of that House? Was it fair towards the House of Commons itself—that

they should be represented as guilty of harsh, improper, and unparalleled conduct towards the mover of the accusation—or should be held up to the public as impeding, what every one was more anxious than another, to investigate and bring to light? If they were to be tried for such an offence, it was only necessary for their acquittal, that their conduct should be fully known! There never was a case in which more fairness, or a greater desire to afford every assistance in the investigation of truth, manifested itself. It was no wonder, therefore, that his feelings were excited when he heard the conduct of their proceedings so arraigned. He could not forbear, however, referring to one proof of the approbation of the hon. gent. himself (Mr. Wardle) of the whole of the conduct of the cause. During the whole of the proceedings there had not been a single division. Not a single proposition had been insisted on by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), and in which he persevered, which had not been conceded to him, or in the negative to which he had not acquiesced, by waving a decision upon it. The noble lord would not take it amiss that he (Mr. Perceval) declared his conviction, if there was a member of that House who would not acquiesce in any thing of which he did not approve, without pressing the question to the only mean by which its merits could be properly decided on, the noble lord was that person. In addition to the feeling which naturally attended an adherence to what a man thought right, the noble lord would here have had the peculiar pleasure of holding up his boasted minority, however small, to the applause and admiration of the country—a gratification of which he would not willingly have deprived himself, had a favourable opportunity presented itself. The noble lord had also complained that things were not allowed to take their natural course, but that the business had been pressed forward with unbecoming rapidity. He did not recollect any instance of this kind. It was but fair that in so momentous charges, no delay should take place, but the hon. gent. himself could not have forgotten that on one occasion, when one day seemed more convenient to the hon. mover than another, the more remote day, because the more convenient to him, was fixed on. As to the charge of infamy attaching to one party or another,—all that was meant, or had been said, was, not that infamy must attach either to the hon. gent. or to the royal personage; but that, if the accusations were false, and a conspiracy should be found to exist, infamy would attach to those who had been the cause of stigmatizing his royal highness; and if the gentlemen, who brought forward the accusations, should be found to have too easily lent themselves to an unprincipled conspiracy, that they, would not, by their conduct, have added to their own credit. . . . . [He afterwards spoke as follows, in answer to the last part, above-quoted, of Lord Folkestone's speech.]———The noble lord, however, went too far in stating that there were various instances in which the investigation had been obstructed in this case. He (Mr. Perceval) should not put it to his everlasting recollection, but he put it to his candour, to say what impression such a statement was calculated to make in the public mind? What then would be said, not that there might be charges, which if gone into might implicate the character of the royal person alluded to; but that there was something which prevented the sifting the charges to the bottom, and that many others could be adduced if required. Would it not be equally fair and candid to suppose, as the hon. mover must have felt, that the investigation into some of the charges at least did not support him in his original statement, that those which remained unopened were of this description, and would be found equally defective? He submitted to the noble lord, if it would not be better, before moving for a select Committee, similar to that which had already been appointed, to try what the summons of the House would do, and if he himself could not in the mean time procure inspection of the papers. He was sorry to have delayed the House, but it was impossible for him to have remained silent after what had fallen from the noble lord.——Mr. Adam said, that it was customary in the House to give to the different members the character which belonged to them: to a baronet the appellation of "the worthy baronet"—to a member of the learned profession that of "the learned "gent." and to the unprofessional members of the House that of "the hon. "gent." It was most irregular and unjust to use any descriptive epithet but such as he had mentioned. He complained, therefore, in the strongest manner of the term "*professed adviser* of the Duke of York," used towards himself by the noble lord. If the noble lord had said, that to the suggestion of "a learned gent." the line of conduct adopted by the House was

owing, he should have had no observation to make; but when it was to go forth to the public that he, a member of Parliament, acted in a Parliamentary proceeding as the *professed adviser* of the Duke of York, he had reason to complain of such an expression, and endeavour if possible to counteract its tendency. He begged the House would excuse his calling their attention to a subject wholly personal; he owned he was actuated by the most serious feelings on this subject. He was anxious in the most solemn manner to repel the imputation which that appellation might cause. —He knew how unpleasant it was to the House to listen to personal observations, but it was important to him that he, whose life had been passed in the discharge of a variety of public duties, should endeavour to preserve the character which he trusted he had acquired without touch or stain. He was not aware that on any occasion he had failed in the discharge of the various obligations which had from time to time been imposed upon him; whether during his Parliamentary life of above twenty-five years, or in the private concerns of his family, exposed as he had been to encreasing pressure, to the *res angustæ domi*; by which, however, he had never been tempted to deviate from the strict line of political or moral integrity. Although the hon. gent. by whom those charges were originated had intimated that the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate them would accord with his opinion, he had not thought proper to move for such a committee An hon. gent. opposite had suggested proceeding by a Parliamentary Commission; with those two exceptions, he did not recollect a dissenting voice against the course ultimately adopted by the House. He appealed to the House, whether there had been the least interruption to the most free and unrestrained enquiry. With respect to himself, he was in the judgment of the House, whether he had ever said or done any thing that gave a colour to the appellation of "professed adviser of the Duke of York." He hoped that the country would be satisfied that this matter, which had been introduced publicly, had been conducted openly, and in a manner that was in the highest degree honourable to the House of Commons.——Mr. CALCRAFT blamed the noble lord for the censure which he had chosen to pass on the House, and for the assumption which he had chosen to make in stating that his hon. friend, in the charge which he had brought forward, had been supported by himself alone. Had that hon. gent. been so deserted as his noble friend described him to be, *he should not have wanted his aid;* but having on a former occasion, upon an inquiry into the conduct of the Medical Board, witnessed that hon. gent.'s ability, he should have thought it highly indelicate had he *thrusted* himself into his councils *unasked* and *uncalled for*. That hon. gent. had evinced the utmost manliness and delicacy in standing on the ground on which he had chosen to stand, single and unsupported. He had rested his character on the event, and the event would justify him; but it was not becoming any member to *arrogate to himself* peculiar praise on this occasion. The noble lord ought to give credit to others for acting on principles similar to those on which he had himself acted. With respect to the noble lord's panegyric, he thought he had *read it in some publication;* if not, perhaps he *might yet do so*. He could not, however, but be of opinion, that it would have proceeded with more propriety from any other lips than his own."

This is a debate full of interest. We will go backwards in our remarks, because Mr. Calcraft's charge against lord Folkestone is of a sort to demand immediate comment. What *arrogance* did his lordship discover? How did he pronounce a panegyric on himself, in stating, that, until within a few days, Mr. Wardle had received no assistance from any member out of the 658, and that all he had now received, *out of doors* (for such was the manifest meaning) was what little he, lord Folkestone, had been able to give him? Was it not the well-known *truth*, and was it not necessary to state that truth, in a manner that it might be imprinted upon the minds of the injured and insulted people? That it was *out of doors* that his lordship meant is certain, because he says, that Mr. Wardle has had no "*agent*" to assist him; and, then, he goes on to say, that Mr. Wardle has not had the assistance of "the services of a *Lowten*, or a *Wilkinson*, "to arrange his documents, and to mar"shal his witnesses."——It is true, notoriously true, and is universally seen and acknowledged, that, since Sir Francis Burdett was disabled by the gout from attending the House, lord Folkestone has been the only man, who has actually appeared as an *assistant* of Mr. Wardle.——As to the panegyric that Mr. Calcraft has read, or expects to read, upon the noble lord,

in some publication, he may be disappointed, for the conduct of his lordship needs none; nor is there any pen that can do justice to the subject. Mr. Calcraft was safe, here, in one respect; for there was no fear of *retaliation* on the part of his lordship.—— One thing, respecting lord Folkestone, however, I must state, and that is, when the late ministry (under whom Mr. Calcraft had a fat post) came into power, they offered his lordship a place of fifteen hundred pounds a year, of which he declined to accept; though, it will be remembered by most men acquainted with politics, that he all along, except upon particular occasions, continued to support them. There is no man, who knows my lord Folkestone, who is acquainted with that steady adherence to truth and to principle which is innate in him, and with that modesty, which is so prominent a part of his character, with his fidelity to his word and to his friends; there is no man, who is at all acquainted with his character, who will ever believe, that he has, upon this occasion, acted from any other motive than that of a conviction that his duty required him to do what he has done.——Oh, oh! It seems, then, that there were many members ready and willing to assist Mr. Wardle *from the first*, had they not been convinced, that so great were his own individual powers, he wanted no assistance; and even *Mr. Calcraft himself*, would have tendered the use of *his* abilities, had he not entertained this conviction. Come, this is some comfort. But, if I mistake not, at the first opening of the business, there was only Sir Francis Burdett (who seconded Mr. Wardle's motion), and my lord Folkestone, from whom Mr. Wardle received even the smallest degree of countenance. And when, at a later period, the charge about Captain Maling, owing to a mere error in words, *appeared to have failed*; at this period, if I mistake not, the party, to which Mr. Calcraft belongs, did, in a most formal and solemn manner, *disclaim all connection with Mr. Wardle*, with respect to these charges, and that one of that party did distinctly say, that he had sent a message to him *not to bring forward the charges*, adding, that he had been *imposed upon* by the actors in a *foul conspiracy* against the Duke. That this was the case the public well knows; and, therefore, this declaration, that there were many members ready and willing to assist him, had they not been convinced that his own abilities rendered their assistance unnecessary, comes a little too late in point of fact, and a little too soon in point of time; because the formal and solemn disclaimer is still fresh in the memory of every man, who is not an ideot.——Now, as to the phrase, which appears to have given so much offence to Mr. Adam, Lord Folkestone says, that he by no means meant it in the way of reproach; and, I must think, that the reader will agree with me, that, when Mr. Adam's first speech upon the subject is recollected; when it is recollected, what he said about the 20 years that the pecuniary affairs of the Duke had been in his hands, and about the unreserved communication between them; when it is recollected, that he then took upon himself to say, that the charges would prove unfounded; when it is recollected, that he has since held (as he acknowledges) conferences and consultations with the Duke and Colonel Gordon and Mr. Perceval, relative to matters connected with the inquiry; that he has had a witness, if not witnesses, in favour of the Duke, sent to him, who put questions to them, previous to their coming to be examined by the House; that (as he acknowledges) he was apprized of similar previous examinations going on at Mr. Lowten's office; and, finally, that he was consulted and did advise relative to the time and manner of producing the circumstance of the pretended forgery: when all this is recollected, was there any thing unjust, any thing harsh, any thing overstrained, in lord Folkestone's calling Mr. Adam the "*professed* adviser of the Duke "of York?" Besides, observe the *occasion* on which the phrase was used. It was in reference to the *mode* of inquiry, and bore, upon the face of it, a proof, that it was not meant to convey to the world an idea, that Mr. Adam had, while a member of the House, while a *judge* in the case, acted, at the same time, as the *advocate* of the Duke. There was nothing in the words to convey such a meaning; and, therefore, it does seem strange to me, that Mr. Adam should have felt so sore upon the subject.——I shall, hereafter, endeavour to give a fair view of *Mr. Adam's case*, who, at present, certainly does not stand so well with the public as I could most sincerely wish; and I cannot refrain from observing now, that, we must be involved with such people, by slow degrees, as Mr. Adam appears to have been; we must be exposed to the solicitations of the all-powerful; we must experience their importunities and feel the weight of influence, pressing from so many quarters,

before we can say, that we should not have acted as Mr. Adam has acted. All that he says, respecting his general character and conduct, is, I am convinced, perfectly true. It was *integrity*, and not *sycophancy*, that recommended Mr. Adam to the selection of the Duke of York, because the repair of dilapidated affairs wanted integrity; but, it does not follow, that, because I choose such a man to husband my means, on the one hand, I should not profligately waste them, on the other; or, that I should be at all the more scrupulous in the way of providing for my pleasures.——But, it is now time to come to the *complaint* contained in Lord Folkestone's speech.——And, is it not true, that the *mode of proceeding*, pointed out by Mr. Wardle, the maker of the charges, was *not* adopted? Is it not true, that this is *quite novel* in the history of parliament? Was not the mode Mr. Wardle proposed overruled? Did not the House refuse him that mode, which he wished to be adopted? Is not all this well known to the people, and ought not the people to hold it in everlasting remembrance? Mr. Wardle, we are told by Mr. Perceval, *did not object* to the setting aside of his proposed mode of inquiry; there was no *division of the House* upon the question. Very true; but, did not Mr. Wardle clearly see, what must have been the result of such an objection, or such a division? As it *has happened*, the mode which has been adopted is more advantageous to the public, than the mode proposed by Mr. Wardle would have been; and, I must confess, that, morally certain that what has come out, would come out, I was glad to see the examination at bar determined on. But, still, Mr. Wardle's mode *was over-ruled*; and this being something, as lord Folkestone says, unprecedented in the history of the parliament, it was, and is, just ground of complaint, on the part of Mr. Wardle, who, it cannot be denied, did meet, at the very out-set, with a hostile reception. What other construction can possibly be put upon the out-cry about "*a jacobin conspiracy*," and "the libellous-"ness of the press?" Mr. Wardle comes and says; "I accuse the Duke of York of "this and of that." What is the answer? why, that there has long existed a conspiracy, of which the public writers form a part, to write and talk down the Duke of York, the army, the church, and the monarchical branch of the constitution. This was the answer to Mr. Wardle, from the servants of the king and their supporters; and, from the other side, in a few days after, it was flatly stated, that Mr. Wardle had been *imposed* upon by *a foul conspiracy*. Was not this giving him a hostile reception?——Then, as to *pushing him on*; and leaving no time for search, or for reflection; is it not fresh in the recollection of the public; is it not written in the reports of the debates, that he was pushed on? And that, when Mr. Wardle complained of this, and wished for a day or two to look about him and to think, was it not represented as unjust, and was he not asked: "Is it to be endured, that charges "like these shall hang, from day to day, "suspended over the head of a son of the "crown?" When lord Folkestone, upon one occasion, stated the exhausted condition of Mr. Wardle himself, was he not silenced by the cry of "*go on, go on?*" To say, as Mr. Perceval does, in answer to lord Folkestone, that there have been no *divisions* in the House, upon any of these points; good Lord! what is it! what does that circumstance make against the fact?——The other complaint of lord Folkestone is, that Mr. Wardle had proceeded with the threat of *infamy* contingently attached to him, and that this threat had neither been withdrawn nor modified up to the present moment.——In answer to this Mr. Perceval says, that: "all that "was meant, or *had been said*, was, *not* that "infamy must attach either to Mr. Wardle "or the Duke; but that, *if the accusation* "*were false, and a conspiracy should be found* "*to exist*, infamy would attach to the con-"spirators, and that *if* the gentlemen "who brought forward the accusations, "*should be found to have too easily lent them-*"*selves to an unprincipled conspiracy*, they "would not, by their conduct, *have added* "*to their own credit.*"——Oh, dear me! Lack-a-day! Here are an abundance of very nice qualifications, not one word of which was to be seen, in *any one* of the reports of the famous debate, the ever-memorable debate, the everlastingly-to-be esteemed and preserved debate, of Friday the 27th day of January in the year 1809. In the report of that debate, there appeared these words, as uttered by Mr. Canning, the king's secretary of state for foreign affairs: "The hon. gent. (Mr. "Wardle) *surely* must be *aware*, that hav-"ing undertaken the *responsible* task of "submitting to a British House of Com-"mons such a serious accusation, whatever "may be the result of its deliberation; in "*whatever view* the House shall consider the "transactions which he has disclosed,

" whether they be refuted or substan-
" tiated, *infamy* must attach *somewhere*, ei-
" ther upon the ACCUSED or the AC-
" CUSER."——These were the words, and these words, lord Folkestone now, in the face of the House, after Mr. Perceval's speech, asserts to have been used, and no one contradicts him; therefore, we must conclude, that the reports of the several news-papers, which all agree as to these words in particular, were correct. That, by ACCUSER, Mr. Canning *might* mean the " conspiracy" is certain; but, taking in the former part, the " *responsible*" part of the sentence, there is room to believe that he might, and did, mean Mr. Wardle; and, by the ACCUSED, it is utterly impossible, that he could mean any other person than the Duke of York.——Mr. Perceval, when, in the close of this part of his speech, he complains of lord Folkestone's saying, that the inquiry had manifestly suffered from the fear of people capable of giving information, that their doing so might *offend the government;* when Mr. Perceval thus complains, and says, that such a statement is calculated to create unfounded *suspicions* in the country, he appears to have forgotten, that his lordship has spoken of *a fact;* that he had stated, that he himself had applied to a person to give up certain papers; that this person was unwilling to give them up; " that the jet of his objection was, " that, *as the defence of the Duke had been* " *taken up as a ministerial measure*, he was " apprehensive that he would incur their " displeasure, and the displeasure of those " immediately under them, which would " probably *operate to the ruin of himself and* " *family.*" To this his lordship added: " I do assure the House, that this is not " the only instance where similar appre-" hensions have prevented persons in pos-" session of strong testimony, from com-" ing forward, *particularly officers in the* " *army*, and where information was with-" held from the manner in which the " thing had *been taken up by the king's ser-* " *vants in that House.*" And, is not this very natural? Was there any need of the positive fact, stated by lord Folkestone, to make the country believe this? Is there one man amongst us, who would not have anticipated what lord Folkestone expressed? When the ministers and their friends began, when they received the charges, with denouncing as *conspirators* all those, who had wrote and talked against the Duke of York, was it not to be expected, that all those persons, who were, in any way, dependant upon the government, would, if they possessed information upon the subject, take 'special care not to let it be known? And would not this, in a particular manner, apply to officers in the army, whose *sole* means of preserving their rank in life, and even of obtaining bread, depended upon the ministry, including that very person, against whom the charges were preferred? A conclusion so obvious could have escaped no man with unaddled brains in his head.——It is useless to endeavour to stop the spreading of this way of thinking. It has, long ago, reached every soul in the country. The mind of the country is completely settled as to this point; and, indeed, upon the whole of the proceeding; all that is now necessary to be done being to place the facts upon record, in a way that they may be with facility referred to.——The diversions, in Spain and Portugal, will be of little avail. There is nobody that cares, or need care, a straw about them. The interesting scene is *at home*, where the taxes are laid and collected. To this scene the people's eyes, after twenty-four years of blindness, are, at last, open; and, though it is possible, that they may be induced to wink for a while, all the arts in the world will never be able to blind them again.——This is good. It is a great thing done. It is a firm step gained in the way of national restoration; and, for this great good, we have to thank, and the whole of the uncorrupt part of the nation most heartily do thank, MR. WARDLE.

Botley, Thursday, 23rd Feb. 1809.

The following Letter, published in the Morning Chronicle of the 20th instant, complains of a mis-statement in my paper of last week. The mis-statement is not *mine*. The name of *Dr.* Glasse was mentioned in the evidence; but, I very gladly give the correction; and should be still more glad to be able, consistently with truth and impartiality, to expunge also, from these scandalous disclosures, the name of Mr. Glasse, his son, who, upon my return to England, was one of the first persons to shew me kindness; who, as often as the occasion has occurred, has uniformly shown towards me the same disposition; whom I never had the smallest reason to suspect capable of meanness of any sort; but whom, on the contrary, I had every reason to regard as an upright and generous man.

" SIR,—I had no design to notice the introduction of my name into the transac-

tions now before the public (in a manner equally painful and astonishing to myself,) otherwise than by making to my private and personal friends, the solemn asseveration of my ignorance as to the steps taken with a view to serve me, by mis-guided zeal and erring gratitude; accompanied by such proof as the nature of the case admits. ——But the pride of conscious innocence will not allow me to be silent, when I observe in several of the papers, and particularly in The Political Register of yesterday, the name of my honoured father confusedly blended with my own. It is to shield his fair fame from the possibility of censure, that I thus address you, Sir, requesting you to give the utmost publicity, to the declaration, "that the introduction "of Dr. Glasse's name into these miserable "discussions is totally and altogether "founded in error." To those who are acquainted with the tenor of Dr. Glasse's life during a ministry of more than fifty years, this avowal may be unnecessary; it would, however, be unjust, that an idea to his prejudice should even accidentally be imprinted on the mind of a stranger. By my own conduct, as far as honesty of intention goes, I am ready to stand or fall; and on that ground I am little affected even by the attacks of calumny; but I confess myself unequal to enduring the thought, that the closing hours of a blameless and venerable man should be imbittered by imputations abhorrent from his character; or that he should be implicated in a charge, against which every feeling of his soul would not fail to revolt. I am, Sir,—Your obedient humble servant,

GEORGE HENRY GLASSE."

Rectory House, Hanwell,
Feb. 19, 1809.

COBBETT'S
COMPLETE COLLECTION OF
State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The THIRD PART of the above Work will be published on Wednesday, the first of March. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume will be ready for delivery on the same day.

COBBETT'S
Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME is in the Press. All Communications for the above Work, if sent to the Publishers in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Twenty-fifth Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, dated Benevente, Jan.* 5.

His Majesty being informed that the English army was reduced to less than 20,000 men, resolved upon moving his head-quarters from Astorga to Benevente, where he will remain some days, and from whence he will proceed to take a central position at Valladolid, leaving to the duke of Dalmatia the task of destroying the English army.—His Majesty, on being informed that in the places where the prisoners were collected, and where there are ten Spaniards for one Englishman, the Spaniards ill-used and plundered the English, gave orders for separating the English from the Spaniards, and for observing towards the former a particular sort of treatment.— The rear-guard of the English, by accepting battle at Prievas, had hoped to enable the left column, which was chiefly composed of Spaniards, to form its junction at Villa Franca. He also hoped to gain a night, in order more completely to evacuate Villa Franca. We found in the hospital at Villa Franca 300 English sick or wounded. The English burnt in that town a large magazine of flour and corn. They also destroyed several artillery carriages, and killed 500 of their horses. We have already counted 1600 of them left dead on the roads. The amount of the prisoners is considerable, and increases every moment. In the cellars of the town we found several English soldiers who had died from drunkenness.— The head of Merle's division, forming part of the duke of Dalmatia's corps, came up with the advanced guard on the 3rd. At four p. m. it reached the rear-guard of the English, who were upon the heights of Prievas, a league before Villa Franca, consisting of 5000 infantry and 600 cavalry. This position was a very fine position, and difficult to attack. Gen. Merle made his dispositions. The infantry advanced, beat the charge, and the English were entirely routed. The difficulty of the ground did not permit the cavalry to charge, and only 200 prisoners were taken. We had some 50 men killed or

wounded. Gen. Colbert advanced to see if the cavalry could form; his hour was arrived, a ball struck him in the forehead, and he lived but a quarter of an hour. There are two roads from Astorga to Villa Franca. The English took the right, the Spaniards the left; they marched without order, were cut off and surrounded by the Hanoverian Chasseurs. A general of brigade and a whole division laid down their arms.—The head-quarters of the duke of Dalmatia were, on the 4th in the evening, at the distance of ten leagues from Lugo. On the 2nd his Majesty reviewed at Astorga the divisions of Laborde and Loison, which form the army of Portugal. These troops see the English flying, and burn with impatience to get up with them. —His Majesty left as a reserve at Astorga, the corps of the duke of Elchingen, who has had his advanced guard on the passes into Gallicia, and who is enabled in case of emergency, to support the corps of the duke of Dalmatia.—Since the 27th ult. we have taken more than 10,000 prisoners, among whom are 1,500 English. We have taken also more than 400 baggage waggons, 15 waggons of firelocks, their magazines, and hospitals. The English retreat in disorder, leaving magazines, sick, wounded, and equipage. They will experience a still greater loss, and if they be able to embark, it is probable it will not be without the loss of half their army. But informed that the army was reduced below 20,000 men, resolved to remove his head-quarters from Astorga to Benevente. We found in the barns several English who had been hanged by the Spaniards; his Majesty was indignant and ordered the barns to be burnt; the peasants, whatever may be their resentment, have no right to attempt the lives of the waggoners of either army. His Majesty has ordered the English prisoners to be treated with all the respect due to soldiers who have manifested liberal ideas, and sentiments of honour. On the 4th, at night, the duke of Dalmatia's head-quarters were ten leagues from Lugo.—Gov. De St. Cyr's division entered Barcelona on the 17th. On the 15th he came up with generals Reding's and Vives's troops at Lieras, and completely routed them. He took six pieces of cannon, 30 waggons, and 3000 men.—We have received the confirmation of the news announcing the arrival of the 7th corps, under gen. Gouvion St. Cyr, at Barcelona. He entered that place on the 17th. On the 15th, he fell in with the troops commanded by generals Reding and Vives, and completely dispersed them. He took from them six pieces of cannon, 30 caissons, and 3000 men. By means of the junction of the 7th corps with the troops under general Duhesme, we have a large army at Barcelona.—When his Majesty was at Tordesillas, he had his head quarters in the outward buildings of the royal convent of St. Claire. It was to this convent that the mother of Charles V. had retired, and where she died. The convent of St. Claire was built on the scite of a Moorish palace, of which about two halls remain in fine preservation. The abbess was presented to the Emperor. She is 75 years of age, and for 65 years she had not gone out of her cloisters. She was considerably moved when she passed the threshold; but she conversed with the Emperor with much presence of mind, and obtained several favours for her friends.

Intercepted Letter to the Marquis De Romana:

"Sir,—I should not have detained your instructions so long, had not sir John Moore returned very late to Villa Franca. He arrived greatly fatigued. I delivered your letter to him, to which he cannot return an answer till to-morrow; but he desired me to inform you, that he would set out at an early hour. There are at Benevente, 2 or 300 of the French cavalry, who annoy our stragglers between Benavente and Villa Franca. General Moore begs you will place a battalion on the heights over the road, where they may fire on them without any risk.—There is no news. We know nothing of the movements of the French, and we continue to retreat. I am not certain that sir J. Moore will allow me to return to your excellency. In that case, permit me to express an hope of meeting with you in London, in better times; for be assured, sir, I retain a grateful recollection of your kindness, and am with the greatest respect, &c. M. Lymer."

Villa Franca, Jan. 2, 1809.

Twenty-Sixth Bulletin, dated, Valladolid, January 7.

After gen. Gouvion de St. Cyr entered Barcelona, he proceeded to the Lobregat, and forced the enemy's intrenched camp, and took 25 pieces of cannon. He then took Tarragona, a place of great importance.—The annexed Reports of generals Duhesme and St. Cyr, contain the details of the military events that have taken place in Catalonia to the 21st of December. They do the greatest credit to gen. St. Cyr. Every thing that has taken place at Bar-

celona is to the praise of gen. Duhesme, who has displayed great talents and firmness.—The troops of the kingdom of Italy have covered themselves with glory; their excellent conduct has sensibly affected the Emperor. They are in truth chiefly composed of the corps formed by his Majesty in the campaign of the year five. The Italian picked men are as wise as they are brave; they have given rise to no complaint, and have shewed the greatest courage. Since the time of the Romans, the people of Italy had not made war in Spain. Since the Romans, no epoch has been so glorious for the Italian arms.—The army of the kingdom of Italy is already 80,000 strong, and good soldiers. These are the guarantees which that fine country has of being no longer the theatre of war. His Majesty has removed his head-quarters from Benevente to Valladolid: He received to-day all the constituted authorities.—Ten of the worst of the lowest ranks have been put to death. They are the same who massacred gen. Cevallos, and who for so long a time have oppressed the better sort of people.—His Majesty has ordered the suppression of the Dominican convent, in which one Frenchman was killed. He testified his satisfaction at the convent of San Penete, whose monks are enlightened men, who, far from having preached war and disorder, of having shewn themselves greedy of blood and murder, have employed all their cares and efforts to calm the people and bring them back to good order. Several Frenchmen owe their lives to them. The Emperor wished to see these religious men; and, when he was informed they were Benedictines, whose members have always rendered themselves illustrious in literature and sciences, both in France and in Italy, he condescended to express the satisfaction he felt at owing this obligation to them. In general the clergy of this city are good—The monks who are really dangerous are the fanatic Dominicans, who had got possession of the inquisition, and who having bathed their hands in the blood of a Frenchman, had the sacrilegious cowardice to swear on the Gospel that the unfortunate man who was demanded of them was not dead, and had been carried to the hospital, and who afterwards owned, that after he had been killed he was thrown into a well where he had been found: Barbarians and hypocrites, who preach intolerance, excite discord and blood, you are not the ministers of the Gospel! The period when Europe beheld, without indignation, the massacre of Protestants celebrated by illuminations in great cities can never be revived: The blessings of toleration are the first rights of man; it is the first maxim of the Gospel, because it is the first attribute of charity. If there was a time when some false teachers of the Christian religion preached intolerance, they had not then in view the interest of heaven, but those of their temporal influence; they wished to be powerful amongst ignorant people. When a monk, a theologist, a bishop, a pope, preaches intolerance, he preaches his own condemnation; he gives himself up to be the laughing-stock of nations.—The duke of Dalmatia will be to-night at Lugo. Numerous columns of prisoners are on their march thither.—Gen. Davenoy proceeded with 500 cavalry to Toro. He came up with two or 300 men, the remains of the insurrection. He charged them, and killed or took the greater part. The colonel of the Dutch hussars was wounded in the charge.

Twenty-seventh Bulletin, dated Valladolid, Jan. 9.

THE duke of Dalmatia, after the battle of Prievas, proceeded to expel the English from the post of Piedra Fella. He there took 1500 English prisoners, five pieces of cannon, and several caissons. The enemy was obliged to destroy a quantity of baggage and stores. The precipices were filled with them. Such was their precipitate flight and confusion, that the divisions of Lorge and Lahoussaye found among the deserted baggage, waggons filled with gold and silver; it was part of the treasure of the English army. The property fallen into our hands is estimated at two millions.—On the 4th, at night, the French advanced guard was at Castillo and Nocedo. On the 5th, the enemy's rear-guard was come up with at Pueste and Ferren, the moment it was going to blow up a bridge, a charge of cavalry rendered the attempt useless.—It was the same at the bridge of Cruciel.—On the 5th, at night, Lorge and Lahoussaye's division were at Constantine, and the enemy a short distance from Lugo. On the 6th the duke of Dalmatia was on his march to reach that city.— *(To be continued.)*

LONDON: Printed by T. C. HANSARD, Peterborough Court, Fleet Street; Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden: Sold also by J. BUDD, Pall-Mall.